LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
4.3.30
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BS 670 .L55 1929
Lingle, Walter Lee, 1868-
1956.
The Bible and social
problems

THE BIBLE AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

THE JAMES SPRUNT LECTURES, 1929
Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
APR 3 19

The Bible and Social Problems

By
WALTER L. LINGLE, D.D., LL.D.
President of the Presbyterian Assembly's Training School, Richmond, Virginia

NEW YORK CHICAGO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXXIX by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

1929

175

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

To my wife,

MERLE DUPUY LINGLE,

who has translated the Bible into life for her husband and children, and who has been given the grace to read in manuscript all that her husband has ever written.

THE JAMES SPRUNT LECTURES

IN 1911 Mr. James Sprunt, of Wilmington, North Carolina, gave to the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary, in Virginia, the sum of thirty thousand dollars, since increased by his generosity to fifty thousand dollars, for the purpose of establishing a perpetual lectureship, which would enable the institution to secure from time to time the services of distinguished ministers and authoritative scholars, outside the regular Faculty, as special lecturers on subjects connected with various departments of Christian thought and Christian work.

The lecturers are chosen by the Faculty of the Seminary and a committee of the Board of Trustees, and the lectures are published after their delivery in accordance with a contract between the lecturer and these representatives of the institution. The eighteenth series of lectures on this foundation is presented in this volume.

B. R. LACY, JR.

President, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.

PREFACE

THE invitation which came to me to deliver the James Sprunt Lectures carried with it a suggestion that the general subject of these lectures should be the Social Teachings of the Bible. This subject was probably suggested because it was known that I was deeply interested in this field, and because none of the many lecturers on this foundation who have preceded me has chosen this for his theme.

Ray Stannard Baker, who has since become the official biographer of President Woodrow Wilson, first introduced me to this great subject. One day, about twenty years ago, while I was browsing around in the Carnegie Library in Atlanta, I ran across a magazine article by Mr. Baker, in which he wrote very enthusiastically about Dr. Walter Rauschenbusch's book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis,* which had recently been published. I made haste to get the book, and read it with avidity. It is a dynamic work. Since that time, I have read many volumes on the same general subject, but no other book has so stirred my soul as that first one.

These lectures embody some of the results of my reading and thinking on this subject during the intervening twenty years. I have a deep and abiding conviction that one of the greatest needs of the present time is that Christians should translate into life the social and ethical teachings of our Lord. They are the only solvent for the world's social problems.

W. L. L.

Richmond, Virginia.

CONTENTS

I

Some Essential Definitions 11

II

God's Ideal for the World 33

III

Jesus' Sermon on the Kingdom 58

IV

The Bible and Money 86

V

The Bible and Poverty 108

VI

The Bible and the Family 131

VII

The Bible and War 152

VIII

The Church and Social Reform 170

I

SOME ESSENTIAL DEFINITIONS

IN May, 1911, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States adopted the following recommendation: "In view of the growing importance of many social questions, we earnestly recommend that all of our Theological Seminaries adopt and teach a brief course in Sociology." In September, 1911, I came from a pastorate in Atlanta, Georgia, to Richmond, Virginia, to become a professor in Union Theological Seminary. A part of my work was to teach the brief course in Sociology which the General Assembly had so earnestly recommended. There had been no such course in the Seminary, and it was pioneer work so far as the Seminary and I were concerned.

It was very interesting to note what various ministers and church members had to say about the introduction of such a course into a Theological Seminary. First of all, there came to me a delicious letter from a gifted minister in our church. I have preserved the letter through all these years. After expressing himself as greatly pleased with the idea of having such a course in a Theological Seminary he said:

"I might even hazard the suggestion that it would do more good for the Kingdom for the young theologue to

know something about the housing conditions of the Richmondites than to be intimately acquainted with the family life of the Hittites; the Richmondites being still alive, and the Hittites having been a long time dead."

A distinguished professor in another Theological Seminary did not take so kindly to the idea, and wrote at length against it in one of our church papers. His article was entitled "Sociology." In his article he got Sociology and Socialism fearfully and wonderfully mixed. In fact, he regarded the two as being entirely synonymous. After paying his respects to Socialism at length he gave us this very interesting paragraph: "It can be seen at a glance that Socialism is a scheme of politics, and is as far removed from the distinctive sphere of the Church as any other political program. Why, then, should the Church concern itself especially with Socialism? Why should preachers of Christ's Gospel feel called upon to give it their endorsement from the pulpit? Why should our Theological Seminaries be exhorted to give Sociology a place in their curriculum?" So this article on Sociology went on using the words Sociology and Socialism interchangeably, as if they were entirely synonymous. It was a bad case of mistaken identity.

The most interesting reaction to the announcement of a course in the Seminary on the Social Teachings of the Bible was that of a fine Christian woman, who had a half-dozen charming daughters. She remarked that she was so glad that I was to give a course on "The Social Teachings of the Bible," as her daughters were starting out into society, and that she was not

clear in her mind as to what they ought to do about cards, theatres, and dancing, and now she was so glad that I was going to clarify what the Bible had to say on these subjects.

These three instances are typical of the things which came to me back in those days when the Seminary was trying to introduce a brief course on Christian Sociology, or rather on the Social Teachings of the Bible. They convinced me that such a course ought to begin with some simple definitions. I am still of that opinion. Not many days ago, I saw an article in a metropolitan paper, in which a distinguished professor of Sociology, who frequently writes for the papers, said that a great many apparently intelligent people who write to him from time to time use Sociology and Socialism as synonymous terms. So I hope that you will bear with me while I go back to the rudiments, and inquire into the meaning of quite a number of words and phrases which are necessarily used in such a course as this.

SOCIOLOGY

Let us begin with the word Sociology itself, as it lies back of a large number of these phrases. It is a rather new word, being less than a hundred years old. Fifty years ago there was not a chair of Sociology in any college or university in the world. There are two ways of getting at the meaning of a word. One is to look at its derivation. The other is to look at its definition as arrived at from usage. In its derivation, the word Sociology is a hybrid. It is made up of the Latin word

socius, which means a companion or friend; and the Greek word *logos,* which means a word, reason, or science. From this derivation, we get the intimation that Sociology is the science of society.

When we look into textbooks, dictionaries and encyclopedias for definitions of Sociology, we find so many that we are embarrassed with riches. I like best the one given by Dr. Charles A. Ellwood: "Sociology is the science which deals with human association: its origin, development, forms, and functions." Webster's International Dictionary gives a good definition: "Sociology is the science of the constitution, phenomena, and development of society." Sociology is a study of society.

SOCIALISM

Socialism is a social theory. There are as many different varieties of Socialism as there are of religious denominations, but there are some underlying principles which all these varieties hold in common. Again we can turn to Webster's International Dictionary for a good definition: "Socialism is a political and economic theory of social re-organization, the essential feature of which is governmental control of economic activities, to the end that competition shall give way to co-operation, and that the opportunities of life and all the rewards of labour shall be equitably distributed." Morris Hillquit, who is an ardent Socialist, gives a definition which is much simpler and more tangible: "The Socialist program requires the public or collective ownership and operation of the principal instru-

ments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth—the land, mines, railroads, steamboats, telegraph and telephone lines, mills, factories and modern machinery." With these definitions before him, even a Seminary professor ought to be able to understand the difference between Sociology and Socialism.

SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

This is a phrase which is often found in books and magazines and newspapers, but somehow nobody ever stops to define it for us. I have not been able to find a definition even in the dictionaries or encyclopedias. The only definitions which I have been able to discover are in Biblical language, though the writers of the Bible never heard of the phrase and do not consciously undertake to define it. Social Consciousness is a consciousness of the fact that no man liveth unto himself and that no man dieth unto himself. It is a consciousness of the fact that we are all members of one body. To put it differently still, it is a consciousness of the fact that we are our brother's keeper. It is a growing sense of brotherhood. It is a consciousness of the fact that we are all a part of one great organism, and that if one member suffers, all suffer.

This truth was illustrated with tremendous emphasis by the Great War. The shock was instantly felt throughout the world. Dr. Robert E. Speer brings this truth home to us very vividly in a fine paragraph in his book, *The Gospel and the New World:*

" Within a week from its beginning, the effects of the war

were felt to the farthest corners of the earth. Transportation between nations was disarranged or ceased altogether, mails stopped, factories closed in Santiago and Shanghai. Remote islands in the Pacific and villages in the interior of Africa were involved in the conflict. Missionary babies in the West Coast jungles, dependent upon condensed milk from home, were cut off from their supply. The delicate mechanism of exchange was jarred. International activities of trade and philanthropy were annihilated. The whole world felt throughout every fibre and tissue the shock of an experience which made it aware as never before of the truth of Paul's conception of humanity as an organism with a common life."

I once heard a distinguished lecturer on Sociology illustrate this great truth by a rather amusing incident out of his own experience. He was building a new house. Just about the time the carpenters were ready for the painters to begin, a lady who lived across the street came over and said: "I have come over to inquire as to what colour you are going to paint your house." He said that the inquiry rather irritated him, and that he felt like telling her that it was none of her business. But she was a lady, and he was a gentleman, and of course his thoughts were not put into words. Not only so, but before he had time to say anything, she proceeded about as follows: "You know the colour of your house makes a great deal more difference to me than it does to you. As you live in it, you do not have to look at it. But if I sit on my porch, or even at my window, I have to look at your house and its colour. If you put a blot or a discord on my horizon, you have done me a distinct injury." It was some of

her business, after all. The owner of the house invited her to sit down and discuss colours with him. The result was that they found a colour which was mutually satisfactory.

Social Consciousness is a consciousness of the fact that we are all members of one great organism, and that we are all mutually dependent upon each other. Our dependence upon thousands of other people for the simplest things of every-day life is facetiously but strikingly illustrated by a clipping from an Oklahoma paper, which is quoted by Dr. Elijah E. Kresge. It reads as follows:

"The average Oklahoma farmer gets up at the alarm of a Connecticut clock; buttons his Chicago suspenders to his Detroit overalls; washes his face with Cincinnati soap in a Pennsylvania pan; sits down to a Grand Rapids table; eats Chicago meat and Minnesota flour, cooked with Texas cottolene, on a Sears-Roebuck stove; puts a New York bridle on a Missouri mule, fed with California alfalfa; ploughs a farm covered with a Vermont mortgage, with an Illinois plow. When bed time comes, he reads a chapter from a Bible printed in Boston, crawls under a blanket made in New Jersey, only to be kept awake by an Oklahoma dog, the only home product on the place."

In the same way, if you and I were to trace our lives through a single day, we would discover that during that day thousands and tens of thousands of people have ministered to our needs and comforts. No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself.

SOCIAL SERVICE

This is a much used phrase. In fact, it has been

right badly overworked. Yet it is difficult to discover anywhere a definition of it. I have searched text-books, dictionaries, and encyclopedias, and have found only one definition, and that was so abstruse that I could not understand it. I suppose that we all know what we mean by social service, and yet we find it difficult to define. Here is a simple definition of my own, but it is not satisfactory, because it is not sufficiently comprehensive: " Social service is a ministry to the physical and temporal needs of our fellow-men."

There was much of social service in the ministry of Jesus. The first sermon that He preached in His home town had for its text: " The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor; he hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." We may spiritualize this text as much as we will, and yet there is much social service in it.

When Jesus fed the hungry multitudes, opened the eyes of the blind, healed the sick, cured the lame, and ministered to their physical and temporal needs in any way, it was social service. When the Good Samaritan ministered to the man beaten by robbers, when Peter healed the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, when " the seven " were elected to minister to the poor, and when Paul took up collections all over Asia Minor, Macedonia and Greece for the poor saints in Jerusalem, it was social service. The Bible is full of social service

from cover to cover. We may not like the name. Some of us may prefer to call it Christian service. Yet the fact remains that the Bible is full of the thing the present generation has chosen to call social service.

Bishop Thoburn, as quoted by Dr. Robert E. Speer, gives a striking illustration of the meaning of social service and of the way in which home and foreign missionaries are irresistibly drawn into it:

"It is just as natural for one who has the love of Christ in his heart, if he sees a man hungry, to feed him, or to watch the sick or to devote himself in any way to relieving distress, as it was for Christ when He was on earth. And if any one of you can fail to relieve suffering when it is within your power to do it, let me tell you that you have yet to prove that you have the same kind of love in your heart that Christ had.

"I could give you many illustrations on this point, but I will confine myself to just one. You take a young man out of this meeting and say to him: 'You are going abroad as a missionary. Don't be drawn aside into other enterprises. Keep to the one thing, the preaching of Christ.' 'I shall try to do so,' he says. He lands on an Eastern shore and starts up into the interior of the country, and at the first river that he has to cross, as he goes down to the ferry boat, he finds a row of lepers lining the path, and it comes into his heart at once that those people should have something done for them. He has a new love in his heart as he crosses that river, and some day it will take form. He crosses the river and goes along the highway, and finds a starving child; the little one says, 'My parents have deserted me and I am dying of hunger.' He cannot pass that child, and yet if he takes the child, he becomes responsible

for its keeping, and he has started the nucleus of an orphanage.

"He goes on and perhaps finds the parents dying by the roadside. 'Well,' he says, 'I must take care of these people.' And he founds an almshouse. He goes on upon his journey and he finds the lame, and the sick, and the halt, and the blind, and he says, 'I must relieve these suffering people.' Then he has a medical dispensary and a hospital. They are all there before he reaches his station. His friend comes out to visit him and finds him thus surrounded, and he says, 'I thought you were going to do but one work. I thought you were going to preach Christ.' He answers, 'That was my intention, but I couldn't help it.' No. If he had the love of Christ in him, he couldn't help it."

THE SOCIAL MESSAGE

This is a much used phrase, but nobody ever stops to define it for us; as a result it is often misunderstood and some good people are actually irritated every time they hear it. We speak of the social message of the Bible to distinguish it from what we may call the personal message. There is a very distinct personal message in the Bible. It is directed to the individual. It tells him that he is a sinner and needs a Saviour. It presents to him Jesus Christ as the only Saviour of mankind, and calls upon him to repent and believe in Jesus Christ. It tells him that he must be born again before he can enter the Kingdom of God. It tells him of the necessity of personal purity and holiness, without which no man can see God. Writers on social subjects too often speak lightly of this personal message. They even find fault with John Bunyan because Christian was too much interested in his own personal sal-

vation. At the same time we who believe in personal salvation are too apt to forget that the Bible has a social message.

The social message of the Bible tells us of our relationships and duties to others. It so happens that the first question in the Bible is: "Where art thou?" That is personal and individual. It also happens that the second question in the Bible is: "Where is thy brother?" That is social. The Westminster Shorter Catechism tells us that "the Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man." When you take up your Bible and begin to search for the duties which God requires of man, you will discover that the major portion of these are duties to our fellow-men. In other words, they are social duties. The Sermon on the Mount, the Golden Rule, the Royal Law of Love, and many other portions of the Bible are taken up with our duties to others. The message which the Bible brings us concerning our relationships and our duties to others is its social message. If you will keep your social eye open when you read your Bible, you will conclude that the Bible is full of social teachings. It will be the main purpose of this course of lectures to point out some of the greatest of these.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

We all have our own personal and private problems. They mainly affect us individually. But in addition to these, there are problems which affect whole groups of people, or the whole social organism. These we call

social problems. Each one of you would find it worth while to sit down quietly and make a list of the social problems which are affecting the life of your community most deeply. I shall mention rapidly some of these great social problems which are affecting either the whole world, or large areas of the world.

Here are some of the problems which I see as I study the world about us: War, the eternal conflict between capital and labour which we may call industrial war, the liquor traffic, problems created by extreme wealth, problems created by extreme poverty, marriage, divorce, the social evil, child labour, the race problem, the immigrant, lawlessness, illiteracy, criminology, the dependent classes, bolshevism, public amusements and over-population. These are not simply personal problems. They affect the whole body of society. We therefore call them social problems. Many more might be added to this list which I have rapidly sketched. For centuries thoughtful men and women have been wrestling with these problems, trying to solve them, and thus trying to make the world a better place in which to live. They have not yet succeeded. In fact, some of these problems seem to have grown all the worse as the world's population has grown more dense. For example, we have recently been through the most terrible war that the world has ever known, and prophets of evil tell us that we are rapidly heading towards another war, which will be more terrible still.

For the solution of the world's social problems, various types of social order have been advocated and

various social ideals or remedies have been proposed. Let us look at some of these.

INDIVIDUALISM

This is an order of society in which each man is supposed, as far as it is possible, to live independently of his neighbour. The individualist insists that the State should interfere as little as possible with the affairs of the individual. He lays especial emphasis upon personal rights. The first and most natural order of society is individualism. When our forefathers came to America, they built their homes in the wilderness. Their nearest neighbours were miles away. Each family was a law unto itself. It was largely through individual effort that the wilderness was subdued and the new world was made to blossom as a rose. Individualism necessarily became a part of the very life of the early American colonies. Their laws were based upon the individualistic theory of society. The fundamental laws of America are still largely individualistic.

But as the population of a country becomes more dense, and as a larger proportion of the population is crowded into cities, the individualistic order of society becomes more difficult. There are other people living near us, and we must respect their rights and think of their welfare. When I was a boy living on the farm, I could take my gun and go into the woods and fields and hunt and shoot to my heart's content, and there was nobody to molest or make me afraid. Now that I am living in a city, if I were to go out into my yard and fire that same gun a few times, the whole police

department would be on me in a few moments. I would be putting the lives and well-being of others into jeopardy. As the population becomes more dense, the individual will have to be controlled from within or from without for the good of the whole group, but controlled individualism could hardly be called individualism at all.

As our laws have been based largely upon the individualistic theory of society, so it has been suggested that our religion has been interpreted along lines which are too individualistic. Our hymns, our prayers, and our theology are written largely in terms of the individual. Rauschenbusch has illustrated this by an interesting and somewhat amusing story in his *Theology for the Social Gospel*. When farmers and dairymen ship milk into Toronto, if the health officers find it dirty, or below standard in any way, they pour the milk into the sewers and then paste large, red labels on the empty cans as danger signals. But let Dr. Rauschenbusch tell his own story:

"This hits the farmer where he lives. He may not care about the health of Toronto, but he does care for the good opinion of his own neighbourhood, and when he drives to the station and finds his friends chuckling over the red labels on his cans, it acts as a moral irritant. One day a Mennonite farmer found his cans labelled, and he swore a worldly oath. The Mennonites are a devout people, who take the teachings of Christ seriously and refuse to swear, even in law-courts. This man was brought before his church and excluded. But, mark well, not for introducing cow-dung into the intestines of babies, but for expressing his belief in the damnation of the wicked in a non-

theological way. When his church will hereafter have fully digested the social gospel, it may treat the case this way: 'Our brother was angry and used the name of God profanely in his anger; we urge him to settle this alone with God. But he has also defiled the milk supply by unclean methods. Having the life and health of young children in his keeping, he has failed in his trust. Voted, that he be excluded until he has proved his lasting repentance.' The result would be the same, but the sense of sin would do its work more intelligently."

I leave with you the question as to whether we have interpreted our religion too largely in terms that are individualistic, and too little in terms that are social, and press on to my main line of thought.

Individualism has done much for America and for the world, but individualism has not solved our social problems, and what is more, it cannot solve them. In fact, it is a contradiction in terms to speak of individualism as solving social problems. It creates them, but it does not solve them. We must find a remedy that goes deeper than a mere order of society.

SOCIALISM

We have already seen that Socialism is a theory which would entirely reorganize society. It would not necessarily abolish all private ownership of property, but it would have the government own or control all the natural resources, all the productive agencies, and the public modes of transportation and communication. Socialism is directly opposed to individual competition and substitutes in its stead social co-operation. The United States post-office system is a form of socialism.

The government has taken complete charge of it, and runs it for the good of all the people. The city of Richmond owns and operates the gas plant, which supplies the whole city with gas; and the water system, which supplies the whole city with water. This is a form of Socialism. The out and out socialist would carry this idea to the limit. He believes that this would be the best solvent for our social problems. It would certainly be a revolutionary departure from our present social order.

Socialism has never been tried on as large a scale as individualism, and therefore it is not possible to say from actual experiment whether it would solve the world's social problems. But we can safely say that it would not. It fails to take into account that man is by nature a sinful and selfish creature. Herbert Spencer puts his finger upon the trouble when he suggests that it is impossible to make a golden society out of men with leaden instincts. You will have to find some way of transmuting those leaden instincts into golden instincts. Socialism does not suggest any alchemy by which this can be done.

It is impossible to cure our social ills by simply taking these same, sinful, selfish men and arranging them in a different social order. It may be very well to put the pig in a new pen, but that does not change the nature of the pig. If a well is contaminated with germs, it may be all right to paint the pump, but that will not purify the water. We will have to do something more fundamental than that. As a rule, Socialism has lacked the spiritual note. It has been too

much of the earth, earthy. Some one has suggested that it seeks the kingdom of the earth, rather than the Kingdom of God. Socialism not only destroys individualism, but tends to destroy individuality.

COMMUNISM

This is another social theory which would undertake to cure our social ills by completely reorganizing society. It would abolish all private ownership of property, and place the ownership in the hands of the community or the state. The members of the community would have all things in common. It would have "the labour and the income of society distributed equally among all its members by some constituted authority." Communism is more interested in distribution than it is in production. Socialism is more interested in production. Communism would have the distribution made according to the needs of the consumer, and not according to his ability to produce.

We find a touch of voluntary Communism in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their . . . goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need." From that day to this, there have been many small Christian groups which have tried voluntary Communism. This has been notably true of monasteries and all forms of monastic life. It has never been tried on a large scale until recently. At present, Russia is experimenting with a form of social organization which might be

classified as Communism. It remains to be seen how communistic or how successful her experiment will be.

Some Christians have felt that Communism is the order of society which has the divine approval, because the New Testament tells us that the early Christians in Jerusalem had all things in common. We may reply that there is no evidence that it was done by divine command or that it was practiced by the Church at large. Not only so, but the experiment at Jerusalem does not seem to have been very successful. You will observe in the Acts and the Epistles that Paul spent a great deal of his time, wherever he went, taking up collections for the poor saints in Jerusalem. Their experiment seems to have resulted in such dire poverty that they became dependent upon the Church at large for the very necessities of life.

We can safely say that Communism will never solve the world's social problems. It has always failed wherever it has been tried. As a matter of fact, Communism has usually been practiced by small groups which were running away from the world, trying to solve their own little problems, instead of trying to solve the great world problems. The tendency of Communism has generally been to destroy the family life. It has often advocated having wives and children, as well as property, in common. That idea seems to be widely held in Russia to-day. Communism, like Socialism, is trying to make a golden society out of men with leaden instincts. Humanity needs something which is more fundamental and which goes deeper than

the mere reorganization of society into a different form of social order.

THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL

Human theories and ideals have failed to solve the world's social problems. When we examine them, we see no hope of their doing so. They all leave out of account the fundamental fact that men are sinful and selfish. None of them make any provision for changing human nature. None of them have the power to make men over again. In the face of human failures, many thoughtful men and women are asking whether Christianity offers any solution of our social problems. They know that Christianity offers salvation to the individual Christian; but has it any ideal for the world, and does it offer any solution for the multitudes of social problems which afflict and distress humanity? In other words, has the Bible any real social message? You would probably find three answers to that question out in the Christian world.

One group would answer that Christianity has no social message. They remind us that it is the business of the minister and of the Church to preach the Gospel. Ministers have received a great deal of exhortation of that kind during the past twelve months. But what is the Gospel? That is a question which is worthy of the most serious consideration of which you are capable. It is a much more inclusive term than one might at first suppose. The answer which is usually given is that to preach the Gospel is to preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified. That is a very comprehensive definition. It

includes all that Jesus was, all that He did, all that He said, all that He stood for, all that He suffered, and as the centre of it all His atoning death on Calvary. It means following Jesus in your preaching all the way from Bethlehem to Calvary and Olivet. But when you follow Jesus, you soon find yourself in the midst of social service, and in the midst of some of the most comprehensive social teachings and principles that the world has ever known.

There is another group which seems to find nothing in the Bible but a social message. For them, the social Gospel seems to cover the whole sphere of Christianity. One writer says that where the Bible has one page of theology, it has ten pages of sociology. Another writer says that there is more need for a sociological seminary than there is for a theological seminary. It is no wonder that talk of that kind has driven some minds to the other extreme.

However, there is a golden mean between these two extreme positions. There is a third group who believe that the theological side of the Bible is the greatest side. They believe that the cross, the atoning death of Christ, is the great central theme of the Bible. They believe, with the Apostle Peter, that Christ bore our sins in His own body upon the tree, and that by His stripes we are healed. At the same time, they believe that centred about the cross is a great body of social and ethical teachings, which define our duties to others in all the relationships of life. If the first commandment is to love the Lord our God with all our hearts and minds and souls, the second is like unto it: namely,

to love our neighbour as ourselves. As soon as we touch upon the subject of our neighbour, we are in the realm of the social. As we proceed with these lectures, I hope that you will think of me as belonging to the latter group.

Having thus cleared the way in this introductory lecture, we will turn to the Bible itself in the remaining lectures and see what answer it has to give to those men and women who are asking whether Christianity offers any solution for our social problems, and whether God has any ideal for His world. As we enter upon such a study, it is well to remember that as we journey through the world, or read through the Word, we are apt to see only those things which we have been taught to see. Rauschenbusch illustrates this in an unforgettable way in his *Christianity and the Social Crisis:*

"A man was walking through the woods in springtime. The air was thrilling and throbbing with the passion of little hearts, with the love-wooing, the parent pride, and the deadly fear of the birds. But the man never noticed that there was a bird in the woods. He was a botanist and was looking for plants.

"A man was walking through the streets of a city, pondering the problems of wealth and national well-being. He saw a child sitting on the curbstone and crying. He met children at play. He saw a young mother with her child, and an old man with his grandchild. But it never occurred to him that little children are the foundation of society, a chief motive power in economic effort, the most influential teachers, the source of the purest pleasures, the embodiment of form and colour and grace. The man had never had a child, and his eyes were not opened.

"A man read through the New Testament. He felt no

vibration of social hope in the preaching of John the Baptist and in the shouts of the crowd when Jesus entered Jerusalem. He caught no revolutionary note in the book of Revelation. The social movement had not yet reached him. Jesus knew human nature when He reiterated: 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.' We see in the Bible what we have been taught to see there. We drop out great sets of facts from our field of vision. We read other things into the Bible which are not there."

As we proceed with this study, we need to pray continually the prayer of the Psalmist: "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

II

GOD'S IDEAL FOR THE WORLD

GOD'S ideal for the individual is that he should become perfectly like Jesus Christ. "Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son."

God's ideal for the world is that it should become perfectly like heaven. "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Jesus did not advocate any particular form of civil government or any particular form of social order. He went deeper than that. He was tremendously concerned about the perfect establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth and about the perfect doing of the will of God in the hearts and lives of men everywhere.

I wonder if the casual reader of the New Testament has observed how much emphasis Jesus and the New Testament preachers placed upon the Kingdom of God in their preaching. Let us see.

EMPHASIS UPON THE KINGDOM OF GOD

When John the Baptist began his ministry, his keynote message was: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." A little later, when Jesus entered upon His ministry, He began with that same message: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Later still, we are told that "Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom." When Jesus sent the twelve apostles out, He gave them this commission: "And as ye go, preach; saying, 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'" When He sent the seventy out, He commanded them to preach and to say: "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." As Paul bids farewell to the elders of the church at Ephesus, he says: "And now, behold I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." In the last glimpse which we have of Paul, in the last chapter of the Acts, just before the curtain goes down, we have this record: "Paul dwelt two whole years [in Rome] in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ."

This rapid survey shows us that all of these great New Testament preachers were laying great emphasis on the Kingdom of God. It was the keynote of their preaching. If you will take the pains to count, you will discover that the phrases, "the kingdom of heaven," "the kingdom of God," or "the kingdom" occur about one hundred and fifteen times in the first three Gospels. This shows you something of the emphasis which Jesus and these early preachers were laying upon the Kingdom of God, and especially upon the Kingdom of God on earth. The Kingdom of God on earth was, and is, Jesus' ideal for the world. What does it mean?

Before we go into this discussion, it may be well to turn aside and note that Matthew generally says "the kingdom of heaven," and that Mark and Luke and other New Testament writers generally say "the kingdom of God." Some writers make these phrases mean two different things, and go into elaborate explanations to show the differences. If we will note that frequently in reporting the same event, or the same conversation, Matthew uses "the kingdom of heaven" and Mark and Luke use "the kingdom of God," we must be driven to the conclusion that the two expressions are synonymous. They mean precisely the same thing. If they do not, then we have Matthew reporting that in a given conversation Jesus taught one thing, and Luke reporting that in the same conversation he taught a very different thing. This sort of interpretation would bring the reports of Matthew and Luke into direct conflict. It is far more reasonable to believe that the two expressions are identical in meaning. Matthew probably says "kingdom of heaven" because he was writing especially for the Jews, and the Jews, out of a sense of reverence, did not like to use the divine name too frequently. To them "the kingdom of heaven" meant the same as "the kingdom of God."

Seeing that Jesus laid so much emphasis upon the Kingdom of God, and seeing that the Kingdom of God on earth is Jesus' ideal for the world, it is well worth our while to spend the rest of this hour trying to discover just what Jesus meant by the Kingdom of God, and that is no easy task. It is a very elusive subject. As you study it, sometimes you feel that you are within

grasp of a clear-cut definition of the phrase, and the next moment it eludes you. As we approach the study of this subject, we should do it with modesty, and not with too much dogmatism, for even the apostles, after having journeyed with Jesus for two or three years, seem to have misunderstood what Jesus meant. In this study, we are especially concerned about the meaning of the Kingdom of God on earth, as Jesus' ideal for the world.

THE KINGDOM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Jesus did not invent the phrase, "the kingdom of God." He found it ready at hand when He began His ministry. Even John the Baptist did not invent it. The Jews had used it long before John the Baptist came upon the scene. From the very earliest times, the Jews had been looking for an ideal King and an ideal kingdom.

Jacob, in blessing his sons, back in the book of Genesis, said: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come." Shiloh may possibly mean the Peacemaker or the Prince of Peace. Whatever it means, we have in this passage a prophetic vision of an ideal King who was to come.

In the book of Numbers, Balaam is quoted as saying: "There shall come a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." Whatever else this passage may mean, it points to an ideal King and an ideal kingdom.

As we go on through the Old Testament, this stream of prophecy becomes broader and deeper and clearer.

In the great Psalms, like the twenty-fourth, the seventy-second, and the one hundred and tenth, we see the King revealed in all His beauty and glory. Not only so, but we get some intimation as to the nature and extent of His kingdom. "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth."

The prophets are full of the ideal King and the ideal kingdom. We are all familiar with that exquisitely beautiful passage in the ninth chapter of Isaiah: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever." This is a vision of a King who is divine, and of a kingdom that is everlasting.

Daniel also speaks of the King and the kingdom. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed." Again he says: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most high, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom."

It is not necessary for our purpose to pause and go into a full interpretation of these various passages. The one point that I am trying to make is that all

through the Old Testament the Jews were looking for an ideal King and an ideal kingdom. In due time, they began to speak of this kingdom as the Kingdom of God, or the Kingdom of heaven. Jesus took this phrase, which He found at hand, and probably read into it a fuller and richer meaning, and then used it more than any prophet or teacher in Israel had ever done before His day.

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE KINGDOM

You will find it an interesting study to go through the Gospels and see what interpretations, or misinterpretations, were made of the Kingdom of God by the people who were living in the days of Jesus.

We are told in the Gospel according to John that after the feeding of the five thousand, the people wanted to take Jesus by force and make Him king. They were evidently thinking of an earthly king and of a temporal kingdom. They wanted a leader who could throw off the galling yoke of the Romans, and restore to the Jewish kingdom the glory which it had in the days of David and Solomon.

When Jesus made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem at the beginning of passion week, multitudes followed Him and shouted: " Hosanna: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest." Evidently the multitude was looking for an earthly king and an earthly kingdom. When they saw that Jesus was not intending to found such a kingdom, they fell away

from Him, and no doubt many of the same crowd joined in the cry: "Crucify him! Crucify him!"

Even the apostles seem to have been expecting the same kind of a king and kingdom. They frequently disputed among themselves as to which should be the greatest in the kingdom. They were evidently thinking of an earthly kingdom. You will recall how the mother of John and James asked that her two sons might have the right hand and left hand places in His kingdom. She was evidently thinking of an earthly kingdom.

We are told in the first chapter of Acts that after the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord, as He was on the way to Olivet for His ascension, some of the disciples asked: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" They were thinking in terms of an earthly king and of an earthly kingdom. They wanted a king who would win their freedom from Roman tyranny, and who would restore the kingdom to Israel, and at the same time restore the kingdom to the glory which it had in the days of David and Solomon.

INTERPRETATIONS SINCE THE ASCENSION

There have been four outstanding interpretations of "the kingdom of God" since the ascension of Jesus. As it has fallen to my lot to study and to teach Church history for a good many years, it is natural for me to give these interpretations somewhat in their historical order.

1. Some of the early Church fathers believed that

"the kingdom of God," which is spoken of so frequently by Jesus, is the kingdom which Jesus will establish when He comes again. They were looking for His immediate return, and were expecting Him to set up a kingdom in Jerusalem, and to reign there as an earthly king. Among those who held this view were Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian. They did not all agree in details as to the kind of kingdom Jesus would establish. Some of them held what seem to us rather fantastic views. But they agreed in general that it was to be an earthly kingdom, and that its capital would be Jerusalem. Their view was closely akin to the views of the multitudes who followed Jesus, and who expected Him to set up an earthly kingdom. It was closely akin to the view held by those disciples who asked on the way to Olivet: "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" It was a very literal and very Judaistic conception.

This interpretation of the kingdom was strongly opposed by the theologians of Alexandria, which was the great centre of orthodoxy in the early Church. As a matter of fact, the view was made odious in the early Church by its very friends, who went to all sorts of extremes, and again and again fixed the exact date and the exact manner of the Lord's return. A gifted historian says: "In the feverish expectation of the last day, country, family, and all earthly ties were disregarded. Marriages were dissolved, and the community of goods and the most severe asceticism prevailed." In due time this view was condemned as a heresy by the early Church.

In these lectures, we are not so much concerned with the history of this interpretation, but with the question as to whether it is a true interpretation. There are plenty of good people who hold to this interpretation in some form to-day. There is just one way by which we may be able to determine whether it is true, and that is to turn to every passage in the New Testament where the phrase "the kingdom of God," or "the kingdom of heaven," occurs, and see whether this interpretation will fit into these passages. I have tried that plan. This interpretation seems to fit into a few passages; especially in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, and in the twentieth and twenty-first chapters of Revelation. But it does not seem to fit in the great majority of passages.

We might pause and try a few passages for ourselves now and here. When John the Baptist cried: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," did he mean the earthly kingdom which Jesus is to establish upon His return? When Jesus said: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," did He mean the kingdom which He was to establish upon His return? When Jesus said that the Kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, or like a lump of leaven hid in the meal, was He thinking about the kingdom which He is going to establish when He comes again? So we might go on and try a great many more passages and see that this particular interpretation does not fit into them.

2. Augustine, the great theologian of the fifth century, practically identified the Kingdom of God with the visible Church. He wrote twenty-two books en-

titled, *The City of God.* Milman says, "*The City of God* was unquestionably the noblest work, both in its original design and in the fulness of its elaborate execution, which the genius of man has as yet contributed to the support of Christianity." From this vast storehouse, Protestants have drawn much of their theology, and Roman Catholics have drawn much of their conception of the Church. The Roman Catholic believes that the Kingdom of God is the Church, the Church of Rome. If you are in the Church, you are in the kingdom; if you are out of the Church, you are out of the kingdom. Some Protestant teachers identify the Church and the kingdom.

Again let us turn to the Gospels and see whether this interpretation fits into the context of those passages where "the kingdom of God" is used. It does seem to fit into a few passages. Take for an illustration that noted passage in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew which the Roman Catholics love to quote: "And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." It would carry us afield to pause and go into a full interpretation of this disputed passage, but we can understand how a Catholic, in reading it, would identify the Church and the kingdom. There are one or two other passages where "the kingdom of God" seems to mean the Church.

But this interpretation does not fit into the great majority of passages where the phrase is used. Let us try the substitution in a few familiar passages and see

how discordant it would be. How would it sound to say: "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter the Church"? Or how would this sound: "Seek ye first the Church, and all these things shall be added unto you"? Or take this: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the Church"? Passages like these might be multiplied. We see at once how absurd it would be to substitute the word "church" for "the kingdom of God" in these passages. Our conclusion is that this interpretation would not fit into the great majority of passages where the phrase, "the kingdom of God," is used.

3. A third interpretation is that the "kingdom of heaven" is heaven, the place where true Christians go when they die. This is probably the prevailing view among casual readers of the Bible. If you will recall your own childish ideas, you will remember that "the kingdom of heaven" always meant heaven to you. When the minister read: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," you got the impression that those who were poor in spirit, whatever that might mean, would in the end get to heaven. You thought of heaven whenever you saw or heard the phrase, "the kingdom of heaven."

That interpretation seems to fit in a few passages. For illustration, take this verse in the eighth chapter of Matthew: "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." There are other places where this interpre-

tation would fit. But there are many passages where it would not fit. For example, how would it sound to say that heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, or like a lump of leaven? Were Jesus and John the Baptist thinking of heaven when they came preaching and saying: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"?

4. Jesus nowhere defines "the kingdom of God," but He came near doing it in the seventeenth chapter of Luke: "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." If this is the correct translation, the Kingdom of God is not some external organization, but it is the reign of God in the hearts and lives of men. I am aware that this passage might be translated: "For, behold, the kingdom of God is in your midst." If that is the correct translation, then Jesus taught that the Kingdom of God was already there in his own Person. That would not essentially change the meaning of the passage. But both King James' Version and the American Revised Version prefer the translation: "The kingdom of God is within you." So then, from this point of view, we may define the Kingdom of God as the reign, or rule, of God in the hearts and lives of men.

Let us see whether this interpretation fits into the various passages where "the kingdom of God" is used. Try it in the following passages: "Repent ye, for the

kingdom of heaven is at hand." "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Or try it in the parable of the leaven and in the parable of the mustard seed. In a great many of these cases it seems to fit perfectly, and yet there are some cases where it does not seem to fit.

OUR DILEMMA

Here is the dilemma which we face. There are four outstanding interpretations of "the kingdom of God." When we try to fit these interpretations into the various New Testament passages where the phrase is used, we find that each interpretation seems to fit some of the passages, and at the same time we find that no one of the interpretations will fit into all the passages. What is a poor, mortal student to do under such circumstances?

My conclusion of the whole matter is that the phrase is not always used in exactly the same sense. The Kingdom of God is infinite in its reach. It has many phases and aspects. Sometimes Jesus is speaking of one aspect of the kingdom, and sometimes of another aspect. We use the word "church" in a great many different senses. It may mean a building, or a congregation, or a denomination, or the Church universal. It may mean the visible Church or the invisible Church. We determine its meaning by the context.

Just so, it seems that "the kingdom of God" is used in several different senses. In the petition: "Thy

kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," we see two phases or departments of the kingdom; one is in heaven and the other on earth. Sometimes Jesus is talking about the heavenly phase of the kingdom and sometimes of the earthly phase. The Church is the greatest organization representing the kingdom on earth. It is therefore perfectly natural to associate the two in our thinking, and to speak of them as if they might be identical. The Kingdom of God is infinite. It includes the Church. It includes heaven. It will include the Messianic reign of Jesus when He comes again. It includes the reign of God in the hearts and lives of men. The Kingdom of God is as comprehensive as the universe itself. We need not be surprised, therefore, if Jesus uses the phrase in different senses, as He speaks of the different aspects of a kingdom which is so vast and so comprehensive in its reach.

Down in this part of the country, when we want to test out the orthodoxy of a conclusion, we turn to *Dabney's Theology*, to see what he has to say on the subject. I was greatly strengthened when I turned to Dabney and found this paragraph: "The phrase, 'the kingdom of God,' is used in the New Testament in somewhat varying senses; but they all signify the different aspects of that one spiritual reign called the Kingdom of Christ." Then he goes on to say that it may mean (a) "True religion, or reign of Christ in the heart; or (b) the visible church under the new dispensation; or (c) the perfected Church in glory."

Jesus came into the world to save the lost, and to

establish the Kingdom of God on earth. He was therefore tremendously interested in the earthly phase of the kingdom. This being true, I believe that you will find, in studying the question, that when He speaks of the Kingdom of God, He is generally thinking and speaking of that phase of the kingdom which is on earth. Evidently He was thinking of the earthly side of the kingdom when He taught us to pray: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as in heaven." Jesus' ideal for the world was that the Kingdom of God should come as fully on earth as it has already come in heaven, and that the will of God should be done as perfectly on earth as it is done in heaven.

It is with the earthly aspect of the kingdom that we are concerned in these lectures. The Kingdom of God on earth is the reign of God in the hearts and lives of men. It means the enthronement of God at the very centre of our beings, and the doing of His will in all the relationships of life. This is Jesus' ideal for the world.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

So far we have been discussing, in the abstract, the Kingdom of God on earth as Jesus' ideal for the world. Let us now turn to some of the definite social implications which flow from this ideal. Perhaps we can make them more definite and practical by calling them the laws of the kingdom.

1. *The law of entrance.* The only way to get into the Kingdom of God is to be born into it. Jesus said

to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." What does that mean? We may proceed to answer that question by asking what Nicodemus knew about the use of water in connection with religion. He knew a great deal. Over and over again he had seen water used in the Jewish ritual as a symbol of cleansing. Not only so, but he must have known of the work of John the Baptist, and that John was baptizing multitudes as a symbol of cleansing from sin. To be born of water is to have one's life and heart cleansed from sin and selfishness.

But human nature needs more than cleansing. What if you could take a man who has been living in the mire and forgive him and cleanse him and do nothing else for him, what good would it do? Peter tells us in a very homely, but a very striking figure. Remember that Peter was a very homely man. He says that the sow which was washed has returned again to her wallowing in the mire. It is hardly worth while to wash a hog if you do nothing else for him. He will plunge again into the first mud-hole that he comes to. If you want to keep him out of the mire, you will have to change his swinish nature. A lamb does not wallow in the mire, for the simple reason that it has a different nature.

To be born of the Spirit is to have a new spiritual nature implanted in one's heart. It is to be made a new creature, or if you prefer, a new creation, in Christ Jesus. We are born into the Kingdom of God by having the past cleansed away, and by having a new

spiritual life implanted in our hearts for the future. To be born again is to be made over. Just here we have the most unique contribution which Christianity makes toward the solution of our social problems.

You will remember that Herbert Spencer suggested that you cannot make a golden society out of men with leaden instincts. This constitutes an insurmountable obstacle which no man-made social remedy or ideal has ever been able to overcome. But Jesus, through the power of the Gospel, proposes to transmute these leaden instincts into golden ones. He proposes to remake the individual, and He has the power to do it. In fact, He tells us that we cannot enter the Kingdom of God until we have been made over again. You may be able to get into a fraternal order, a political party, or even into the Church without being made over again, but you cannot get into the Kingdom of God. It is a moral and spiritual impossibility.

Jesus does His greatest work for the solution of our social problems and for the social redemption of the world by remaking individuals and sending them out into society as the salt of the earth and as the light of the world. He did not undertake any great social revolution when He came, but by this slow and steady process He has, for nineteen centuries, been lifting the social ideals of His own people, and remaking the world.

Some people have the idea that if every individual in the world had been born again all of our social problems would be solved. They are mistaken. Perhaps I can prove this by making a statement and asking a

question. I believe that everybody connected with this seminary has been born again. Have all your social problems been solved? Are you living together as a perfect brotherhood? If you are, things have changed mightily since I was a seminary student. The trouble is that so many of us are babes in Christ. If we were all perfect Christians, and all living perfectly according to the teachings of Jesus, all of our social problems would be solved. Remember that Jesus assigned a twofold task to His Church in the Great Commission. The first task was to disciple the nations. The second task was to teach them to live according to the teachings of Jesus. And of these two, the second is probably the greater. So after we are true members of His kingdom, Jesus gives us further kingdom laws for our guidance. Let us look at just a few of these, in order that we may see what manner of world this would be if His kingdom were to fully come, and His will were as perfectly done on earth as it is in heaven.

2. *The law of self-renunciation.* Jesus said: "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." This sentence must have burned itself deep into the hearts of those early disciples. All three of the synoptic Gospels record it. Just what does it mean?

Many Christians have made the phrase "deny himself" to mean some petty self-denial. I have known a girl to deny herself a box of Huyler's candy during Lent, and a man to deny himself a box of good cigars, and they both thought they were doing the thing that Jesus is talking about in the text. I have known a

woman to dismiss her cook during a self-denial week in the church in order that she might give the cook's wages to foreign missions, and she thought that she was doing what Jesus is talking about in this text. And, by the way, it never dawned upon her that she was doing a very unchristian and unsocial thing toward the cook.

To deny oneself goes far deeper than these petty self-denials. It means self-renunciation. Some of the theologians teach that selfishness lies at the root of all sin. Other theologians say that this is a mistaken view. We will have to leave the trained theologians to work this out; but I will say in passing, in the language of children at play, that those who believe that selfishness lies at the root of all sin are on a very warm trail. Selfishness certainly creates a multitude of social problems.

In this notable passage, Jesus tells us that we will have to do more than deny self. We will have to take up the cross. What does He mean by that? The cross stands for crucifixion. It was the custom in Palestine for the condemned man to take up his cross and bear it to the place of his crucifixion. We will have to do more than merely renounce self. We will have to crucify the old self. There is no place for selfishness or self-seeking in the Kingdom of God.

But Christianity is not merely a negative thing. Having denied and crucified self, we must follow Jesus. We must walk in His steps. He is the solution of all of our problems, both personal and social.

3. *The law of love.* The second great commandment is: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." James, the brother of our Lord, calls this the Royal

Law. In this and many other passages, Jesus and His apostles preach to us the Gospel of love. He teaches that we are to love our enemies, our neighbours, and our Christian brothers. He leaves nobody out. Love is to take the place of selfishness. Henry Drummond rightly called love the greatest thing in the world. Paul tells us, in a great, classic passage how love behaves itself: "Love is very patient, very kind. Love knows no jealousy; love makes no parade, gives itself no airs, is never rude, never selfish, never irritated, never resentful; love is never glad when others go wrong, love is gladdened by goodness; always slow to expose, always eager to believe the best; always hopeful, always patient" (Moffatt).

A love like that would be a solvent for a multitude of our social problems. Think of the social problems which are most acute in your community, and then ask yourself what would happen to these social problems if everybody involved had in their hearts the kind of love that Jesus teaches. Jesus does not try to reorganize the social order. He is trying to make Christ-like men and women, who will solve our social problems by living according to His teachings in all the relationships of life.

4. *The law of service.* Love will invariably express itself in service. Nobody ever laid more emphasis upon service than Jesus did. When the mother of James and John asked Jesus that her two sons might have the right hand and left hand places in His kingdom, Jesus told them that they did not know what they were talking about. Not only so, He suggested that they were talking like the Gentiles, or pagans. In

the pagan world a man's greatness is estimated by the number of people he can lord it over. Alexander lorded it over the world, and they called him Alexander the Great. Napoleon lorded it over Europe, and they called him Napoleon the Great. But Jesus said: "It shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister [servant]; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant [bondservant]." Jesus does not measure men by blood, or birth, or social standing, or political position, or by their bank accounts, but by the service which they render to God and humanity in His name.

When Jesus speaks of service, He includes all forms of service from the greatest to the smallest. It is related that a friend once asked Mr. Gladstone this question: "What is the greatest service that one human being can render to another?" The great statesman sat in meditation for a moment, and replied: "The greatest service that one human being can render to another is to lead him to Jesus Christ." Jesus would include this greatest of all services, and at the same time He includes the simple service of giving a cup of cold water to a child of His. He includes feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, ministering to the sick, and every form of social service which is in the catalogue of a present-day social agency.

Over one of the gateways at the University of Virginia is this invitation: "Enter this gateway, and seek the way of honour, the light of truth, and the will to work for men." That is a great motto for a great university. It is in full keeping with the teachings of

Jesus. I was especially struck by the last phrase, "the will to work for men." That kind of a will on the part of college and university graduates would help to solve many of our social problems.

One day, while wandering around in the old Presbyterian Cemetery in Columbia, South Carolina, I found myself, before I knew it, standing by the grave of Dr. Joseph R. Wilson, the father of President Woodrow Wilson. The simple monument to him bore an exquisitely beautiful epitaph, which someone told me was written by the president, who knew how to write as few other men have ever known. One phrase in the epitaph gripped me: "A lover and servant of his fellow-men, a man of God." Next to the grave of Dr. Wilson is the grave of Dr. George Howe, who married Woodrow Wilson's sister, and who died young. He burned his life out in the service of others. On his monument is one simple line: "He loved God and served his fellow-men." If that could be truthfully said of me, I would rather have it written over my grave when I am gone than to have any of the high-sounding epitaphs in Westminster Abbey. When I read those two epitaphs, I said to my soul that it was no wonder that a president, who was brought up in an atmosphere like that should have had a holy ambition to make our nation, not a servant nation, but a serving nation, ministering to all the nations of the world. That was a Christ-like ideal.

If every calling in life could catch Jesus' ideal of service, and live by it, this law of service would solve many of our social problems. Let us name over some of these

callings: The minister, the physician, the teacher, the lawyer, the merchant, the banker, the manufacturer, the capitalist, the labourer and the statesman. If all of these, and the various other callings, were to walk in the steps of Jesus in the way of service, many of the world's social problems would vanish.

5. *The law of stewardship.* Jesus teaches that no man has anything that he can call his own in fee simple. It all belongs to God. "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein." The things which we are accustomed to call our own belong to Him, and we simply hold them in trust for Him. This law cuts deep. It means that we must use all of our money and all of our possessions in a way that He can bless. It must be in a business that He can bless and use; we must have business methods that He can bless; and we must pay a wage that He can approve. As we are going to devote a whole chapter to this subject, I will not elaborate it here. The suggestions that I have made will show you at once that if men everywhere lived by this law it, too, would solve many social problems, especially those which are created by extreme wealth and extreme poverty, and those which are created by the conflict of capital and labour.

THE FIVE LAWS

These five are not the only laws of the kingdom. They are simply taken as samples of some of the great principles which Jesus lays down for Christian living. They give us an idea of the kind of world this would be

if men would live according to the teachings of Jesus in all the relationships of life. They give us an intimation of the kind of kingdom the Kingdom of God on earth would be.

I was once talking over the world's social problems with a very thoughtful Christian man who is at the head of a number of large commercial and industrial enterprises. In trying to give him my conception of Jesus' ideal, I gave him these five laws of the kingdom, and asked him if he thought that it would make any contribution to the solution of our social problems if all those who profess to be Christians honestly tried to live according to these teachings in everyday life. He looked at the floor thoughtfully for a full minute, and then he raised his head and replied: "It would revolutionize the whole commercial and industrial world."

WHAT DO WE PRAY FOR?

When we pray: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," what do we really pray for? A chapter of twenty-four pages in *If Christ Were King*, written by Dr. Alfred E. Waffle about fifteen years ago, gives the fullest and most satisfying exposition of this petition that I have ever seen. Some of the following suggestions came to me through that chapter:

We pray that the kingdom may come and that the will of God may be done in our own hearts and lives; that Jesus may be enthroned at the very centre of our beings, that our wills may be completely yielded to His will, and that we may live according to His teachings

in every department of life, and in all the relationships of life. We pray that His kingdom may come and that His will may be done in our homes as in heaven, and that His teachings may be the supreme law of the home.

We pray that His kingdom may come and His will be done in our schools and colleges and universities and out in the world of literature and art.

We pray that His kingdom may come and that His will may be done in our churches. It was to a church, a big, rich city church, that Jesus said: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock." There was a church which was built in His name and where they were going through elaborate forms of service, and yet Jesus was on the outside, standing at the fast closed door.

We pray that His kingdom may come and His will be done down in the business, commercial, and industrial world—in the mills and mines and everywhere that men toil for others.

We pray that the kingdom may come and that His will may be done in national and international life, and in all the world.

We pray that the name of Jesus may be above every name, and that at His name every knee may bow and every tongue confess that He is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

We pray that the kingdoms of this world may become the Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus.

We pray that the King Himself may come, and that He may reign in the hearts and lives of men throughout the whole earth. "Even so, come quickly, Lord Jesus."

III

JESUS' SERMON ON THE KINGDOM

WE call it the Sermon on the Mount, because it was delivered on a mountainside, but that name is purely accidental, and gives no intimation as to its actual content. It is in reality a sermon on the Kingdom of God. The opening sentence is: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Read through the sermon again and see how frequently Jesus speaks of the Kingdom, the Kingdom of heaven, or the Kingdom of God. The Sermon on the Mount gives us many of the laws of the kingdom, and gives us some idea of what manner of world this would be if the kingdom had fully come, and if the will of God were being as fully done on earth as it is in heaven.

It is not my purpose to expound this sermon verse by verse, or paragraph by paragraph. I wish rather to point out a few of its central teachings, and show how they would affect our modern social problems. As you study the Sermon on the Mount carefully, you feel that Jesus lays down fundamental principles in it which touch practically every social problem that is known to mankind to-day.

RITUAL AND RIGHTEOUSNESS

The central theme of the Sermon on the Mount is

found in Matthew 5:20: "I say unto you that, except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."

The crowd must have been startled at that statement. The scribes and Pharisees were their religious leaders. They attended the services of the synagogue with great regularity. They conformed in the minutest detail to all the forms of worship laid down in the Mosaic ritual. Their orthodoxy was unquestioned. They were so meticulous in the observance of the tithe law that they even tithed anise, mint, and cummin. Sabbath observance was their specialty. When judged by their observance of all religious forms and ceremonies, they seemed to be flawless.

What, then, was the trouble with their righteousness? Jesus tells us in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew and in other places. It was purely formal and external. It did not reach down into their hearts and affect their daily living. They loved to preach, but never practiced. They strained at gnats and swallowed camels. Their lives were like whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful on the outside, but are within full of dead men's bones and all manner of uncleanness. They made long, public prayers on the Sabbath, and during the week devoured widows' houses. In short, they had substituted ritualism for righteousness. They were going through all the outward forms of godliness, but lacked the power thereof.

Jesus is here dealing with an age-long problem in religion. There has always been a tendency in religion to

substitute outward forms and ceremonies for real inward righteousness and daily Christian living. The Old Testament prophets wrestled with this problem. They picture the people of their day as going through all the forms of worship on the Sabbath and other days, but utterly lacking in personal and social righteousness.

We have an unforgetable picture of this in the first chapter of Isaiah. The prophet pictures the people as crowding the temple and its courts. They are bringing all the offerings prescribed in the Mosaic law and more. They are observing all the new moons, feasts, and Sabbaths. No part of the ritual is neglected. Yet they had no personal righteousness and no social consciousness. Listen to the scathing indictment of the prophet: "Your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." Their sins were not only personal sins, but social sins. They were going through the whole ritual on the Sabbath, but during the week they were oppressing the poor, the widows, and the orphans.

In the sixth chapter of Micah, we have the most striking picture of all. The prophet represents God as having a controversy with His people. The mountains are called upon to be witnesses. God recounts His mercies to Israel and pictures her lack of response. The people in turn are asking what more God wants. They are going through all the ritual laid down in the Old Testament. Would He be satisfied if they multiplied the prescribed offerings? Would He be pleased with

thousands of rams and with tens of thousands of rivers of oil? Did He want them to offer up their first-born as some of the surrounding nations did? What did God want?

In response to these questions, the prophet gave utterance to the greatest single statement in the Old Testament: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Note that justice and mercy are social virtues. It is fitting that this great text should be printed far up in the dome of our national Congressional Library, at Washington.

Amos, the rugged prophet of Tekoa, preached against this same tendency to substitute ritual for righteousness. In his fifth chapter, we find this burning passage: "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Note again that justice and righteousness are great social virtues.

These passages from the prophets are striking illustrations of what Jesus had in mind when He said: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven." The righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, like the righteousness of the

people in the times of the prophets, was formal, external, and ritualistic. It did not affect their lives or their daily living. They could go through all the ceremonies of religion on the Sabbath, and actually lead these ceremonies in long and fervent prayers, and then they could go out during the week and devour widows' houses. Jesus demands a different kind of righteousness from that on the part of His disciples. He demands a righteousness which strikes its roots deep in the heart, and results in personal purity and holiness. "As a man thinketh *in his heart,* so is he." Jesus also demands a righteousness that expresses itself in Christian living every day in the week in all the relationships of life.

Many centuries have gone by, but we are facing today the same problem which Jesus and the ancient prophets faced. Men are still trying to substitute ritual for righteousness. The ritual may be very simple, or it may be very elaborate. There are still many church members who seem to have the idea that religion consists almost exclusively in going to church and going through certain forms of worship on the Sabbath. They fail to link up their religion with their lives during the other six days of the week. There are still men who make long prayers on the Sabbath and devour widows' houses during the week.

Did you ever see anybody devour a widow's house? I have seen it over and over again in my ministry. I am thinking now of a friend of mine who died some years ago. He left a wife and a little child and a house worth several thousand dollars. The house was about all the property he had. The wife had a very limited

business experience. All went well for a year or two, and then the widow wrote me in great distress, saying that her home had been sold over her head for taxes, without her knowing it; and that it had been bought by her next door neighbour, her husband's friend, for the sum of fifty-three dollars. I wrote a beseeching letter to the purchaser, urging him to let us redeem the house. He replied: " You do not suppose that I am in business for my health, do you? " Fortunately, we employed a lawyer who discovered that the time allowed by the state for the redemption of the house had not quite expired. It was redeemed, and so far as that particular piece of business was concerned, the purchaser was in business for his health.

Let us hope that there are not many cases like that, and yet I have seen a sufficient number of similar cases in my ministry to convince me that there are still some in the land and in the Church who devour widows' houses. There are still men and women who mistake ritualism for righteousness.

Jesus wants us to worship God. He is not opposed to a form of worship. It is necessary to have some form through which to express our worship. But He is not willing for us to substitute a form of worship for Christian living. He expects to see our worship followed up by lives which are noted for their personal holiness and social righteousness. That kind of righteousness would solve most of the world's social problems, and cure most of its social ills.

Having thus studied this key passage, which contains the general principle that runs through the Ser-

mon on the Mount, let us turn to some of the specific applications which Jesus made of this principle to the social problems of His time.

CHRIST'S CURE FOR HATE

The first specific problem which Jesus deals with in the Sermon on the Mount is that of hate. When we begin to think of it, we realize that hate lies back of many of our social problems. It results in murder, homicide, wars, bitter estrangements, feuds, class conflicts, breaking of home ties, and many other evils. The world is full of hate. Individuals hate each other. Races hate each other, classes hate each other. Nations hate each other. The world's social problems cannot be solved as long as there is hate in the hearts of men. Jesus says that hate is incipient murder. The Apostle John elaborates that idea and says: "He that hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." Perhaps there is nothing which creates more social problems than hate.

But what is Jesus' cure for hate? He deals with this problem in Matthew 5:21-26. He begins at the very fountain source and teaches that we must eradicate the very first traces of hate from our hearts. He always begins with the heart. Contempt may grow into hate. Anger may develop into permanent hate. At their very first appearance, contempt and anger should be plucked up by the roots and cast out of our hearts.

Not only so, but Jesus teaches that the Christian should quickly right any wrong which he has done to another, and which might be the cause of anger or hate.

"If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Translated into modern terminology, this would mean that if you are in the midst of a church service and remember that you have wronged some one, it is better to leave the service and to right the wrong. The righting of wrongs and the curing of hate are more important than offerings and church services. Righteousness is more important than ritual.

We can see instantly that it is the duty of the man who is in the wrong to take immediate steps to right the wrong. But the trouble is that human nature is so constituted that we are seldom willing to acknowledge, even in our own hearts, that we are in the wrong about anything. Jesus understood this. He knew what was in the heart of man and did not need any man to tell Him. So in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, Jesus teaches that it is also the duty of the man who feels that he has been wronged to seek for a reconciliation between himself and the one who has wronged him. In fact, the man who feels that he has been wronged must exhaust every means to effect a reconciliation. He is to go alone and try to win the man who has wronged him. If he fails, he must take two friends with him and try again. If they fail, he must lay the matter before his church, to see if the church can effect the reconciliation. Note well that Jesus teaches that this whole procedure is for the sole purpose of "gaining" the brother who has been alienated.

It is no wonder that when Jesus had finished with this particular teaching that Peter said: "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times?" Remember that Jesus was not talking about ordinary forgiveness when the man who is in the wrong comes and begs our pardon. He was talking about going to the man who has wronged us and taking these several steps to bring about a reconciliation. Peter was asking how often Jesus would expect him to do a thing like that, and intimated that seven times was about his limit. If you and I were to do it once, we would feel that we were approaching perfect sanctification. Yet Jesus replies: "I say not unto thee, until seven times, but, until seventy times seven." So urgent, in the mind of Jesus, is the matter of adjusting wrongs and of eradicating bitterness and hate.

At first glance we may feel that it is unreasonable to require a man who feels that he has been wronged to take steps to bring about a reconciliation. But Jesus is never unreasonable. As noted above, it is very seldom that we believe that we are in the wrong, even when we are. So if we were to wait for the one who feels that he is in the wrong to take the first step, very few reconciliations would ever be effected. Not only so, but it is seldom that either man in a controversy is entirely in the wrong or entirely innocent. It takes two to make a quarrel. Participants are not always the best judges as to who is in the right and who in the wrong. Besides, we sometimes offend others without knowing it. If they would follow Jesus' way and tell us, they would probably find us eager to right the matter.

When I was still a college student, I had an unforgettable experience, which illustrates what I am trying to say. I had a good friend in the college town. He was an old man and I was a very young one. A warm friendship sprang up between us. Along about my Junior year I went into his store one day to get a five-dollar bill changed. I cannot recall just now how I ever managed to get hold of five dollars, but at any rate, I found my old friend in a perfect storm about something. He ordered me out of his store and threatened me with his cane. I did not have the remotest idea as to what was the matter. I asked him to explain. He replied: "The least said, the sooner mended," and drove me out. I went away perplexed and hurt, and without the faintest idea of what I could have said or done to make him angry with me.

I had to go by the store of my old friend on my way to my boarding-house three times a day. If he were in front of his store as I passed, I always said, "Good morning," or "Good evening," as the case might be, but he never made the slightest response. After three months of that one-sided program, as I passed the store one fine morning in May and saluted him with the usual "Good morning," he returned the salute and said: "It's a fine morning, isn't it?" If someone had risen right up out of the cemetery and spoken to me, it would not have surprised me much more. I asked him about his garden. He invited me to go with him then and there to see it. I went, and there in the garden on that fine morning in May, we resumed our friendship without a word of explanation. The years have passed

by. He has long since gone to his reward, and I do not know to this day what it was that I did or said that offended him. If he had only told me, I think that I would have done my best to have righted the wrong, or the imagined wrong. I still feel that I shall have to ask him about it some day.

If individuals, classes and nations would practice the teachings of Jesus concerning the eradication of hate, and the righting of wrongs, many of our social problems would disappear and this world would be a much happier place in which to live. There is no place for hate in the Kingdom of God.

SEX PROBLEMS

In Matthew 5:27-32 Jesus discusses lust, adultery, divorce and marriage. This paragraph brings before us at once all those modern social problems which we classify as sex problems. The sex instinct is among the most powerful of all instincts, and sex problems are among the most difficult of all social problems. The statute books of states and nations are full of laws endeavouring to regulate and control these sex problems. This indicates how urgent and insistent they are.

Jesus goes to the root of the matter, as He always does. He goes right down into the human heart. Sex control must begin in the heart. The man who looks upon a woman with unchaste thoughts in his heart has already violated the seventh commandment in the sight of God. Such thoughts must, by the grace of God, be plucked up by the roots and cast out. Only the pure in heart can be members of the kingdom.

In order to emphasize the urgency and the necessity of this, Jesus uses the strongest possible figures of speech. A man's right eye is one of the most precious of all his possessions. He would not part with it for thousands and thousands of dollars. Yet Jesus says that it would be better for a man to pluck out his right eye and to cast it away than to cherish unchaste thoughts. A man's right hand is another precious possession and is well-nigh indispensable. But Jesus teaches that it would be better for him to cut off his right hand and throw it away than to entertain unchaste thoughts in his heart. Here is an instinct which has its proper and sacred uses, but which uncontrolled works havoc to the individual life and to society. Jesus teaches that it must be controlled at all cost. This control must begin in the individual heart. As we face this tremendous problem, we feel the need of a power that can create in us clean hearts, and that can renew right spirits within us. That power comes through Jesus Christ, and through Him alone.

In this same paragraph, Jesus deals with divorce as a part of the sex problem. This, in itself, constitutes one of the major social problems of to-day. In the United States, there are nearly two hundred thousand divorces granted each year. One marriage in every seven results in a divorce. Churchmen and statesmen are perplexed over the divorce question. All manner of solutions for the problem are being suggested. The most of them are of the earth, earthy.

The solution which Jesus offers in this paragraph is simple enough. The only ground for divorce is unchas-

tity. Overt unchastity results from unchaste thinking. There is no place for unchaste thinking in the Kingdom of God. Therefore, there is no place for overt unchastity and no place for divorce in the Kingdom of God. We try to solve the problem by making divorce laws. Jesus solves it by going to the heart, which is the fountain head of all the trouble.

However, the Kingdom of God has not yet fully come on earth. We have not yet attained to the ideal, and must deal with the actual. As an actual fact, marriage vows are sometimes broken by overt acts of unchastity. Under such circumstances, this paragraph would allow a divorce, but would not make it compulsory. However, it does not allow a divorce for any other cause.

A very practical question arises in this connection, and that is whether Christians should insist that the state should adopt laws concerning marriage and divorce which are in keeping with the teachings of Jesus; and whether they should compel all citizens, whether Christians or non-Christians, to observe these laws. Certainly Jesus meant that His teachings should be final and authoritative for all Christians, but did He intend that they should be forced upon non-Christians by civil law? That is a very difficult question, and one upon which I am not prepared to speak dogmatically. But so far as I can understand the teachings of Jesus, it is my opinion that He wanted people to accept them voluntarily, and that He did not intend that they should be forced upon non-Christians by civil law.

At any rate, the teachings of Jesus are final for the Christian, and that being true, the Christian must ob-

serve the teachings of Jesus concerning marriage and divorce, even if civil laws give a wider latitude.

Before leaving this paragraph, let me remind you again that Jesus here brings before us that whole group of modern problems which we have chosen to call sex problems. Let me remind you also that His supreme remedy for all these ills is not to be found in external laws, but in purity of heart and holiness of life.

NON-RESISTANCE

We now come to the most discussed paragraph in the Sermon on the Mount. It is found in Matthew 5:38-41. The heart of this passage is found in the thirty-ninth verse: "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

When we read this passage, our minds fairly bristle with interrogation points. Should Christians ever use force? Should a boy fight? Should a man fight? Should a nation fight? Is there no place for self-defense in the Christian system? Should a Christian suffer wrong and injustice rather than go to a court of law? These are some of the questions which come trooping to our minds when we read this paragraph.

Dr. Edward Leigh Pell, in his book entitled, *What Did Jesus Really Teach About War?* expresses in a striking way the answer which our own intuitions give to these questions. In the opening paragraphs of the book, he says:

"For mental fatigue I try a walk in the woods; but for mental tangles I like a walk down the street. The street is

better than the woods, for you cannot go many blocks without meeting Life; and in the matter of untangling things, Life, I have found, is as gifted as a deft-fingered woman.

"The other day, as I wandered through an obscure part of the town, I came upon a game little rascal perched upon the stomach of a big, fat, blubbering coward. The youngster remained upon his soft seat until the situation ceased to be interesting and then sprang to his feet. The big boy slowly picked himself up, brushed his clothes and started off without a word. The little rascal gazed after the retreating figure a moment, then sprang after it, seized it by the collar, threw it backward to the ground and sat upon it again. Three times while I stood near, that pathetic figure picked itself up, brushed its clothes and started off; and three times the little fellow sprang after it, seized it by the collar, threw it backward to the ground and sat upon it. When I left—

"Do I mean to say that I left those boys to themselves?

"I do. I left without a word. I wanted to do something, but I could think of nothing. I can think of nothing now. What could I have done? The little fellow did not need my help, and what the big one needed only Heaven could bestow. Besides, I was sick. I was sick at the stomach."

Last year I asked an audience of about five hundred Christian women, mostly mothers, whether a boy ought ever to fight. About four hundred and ninety-nine answered affirmatively by holding up their hands. Only one answered negatively. Evidently there is an intuition in the human heart which says that there are times when it is right for boys and men and nations to defend their lives and their good names. My own intuition is in full accord with this general intuition, which seems to be so well-nigh universal.

However, I firmly believe that Jesus' ideal for the world is that it should be a world in which it will not be necessary for boys and men and nations to use force. When the kingdom has fully come, and when the will of God is as fully done upon earth as it is in heaven, it will not be necessary for men and nations to fight. That is the ideal. But the kingdom has not yet fully come. We are face to face with the actual. As long as the world is what it is, it may be necessary at times for men and nations to defend themselves. It may be necessary at times for a boy to defend himself. While this is true, we should always keep the ideal before our boys and before the nations. An ideal boy in an ideal community would not need to fight. In the same way, an ideal nation in an ideal world would not need to fight.

But, after all, we must bear in mind that Jesus is not primarily speaking about self-defense in this passage. He is talking about the spirit of revenge. He introduces the paragraph with the Old Testament law, which says: "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." That Old Testament law was a great improvement over the law of the jungle. It took the punishment of the offender out of private hands and placed it in the hands of judges. At the same time, it instructed the judges that they must not impose a penalty which was greater than the offense, and that the penalty must be in keeping with the offense.

Jesus takes this Old Testament law and breathes into it a new spirit. He teaches that there is no place for revenge in the Christian life, or in the whole Christian system. That is the key to the interpretation of this

difficult passage. When a man smites you on the cheek, what is he trying to do? Is he trying to kill you? Not at all. He is simply trying to insult you. In the days of duelling, the man who wanted to issue a challenge sometimes approached his enemy and struck him a mild blow on the cheek with his gloved hand. That was enough. The result was a duel. Jesus raises the question as to how the Christian should treat an insult. Shall he resent it with physical force?

Thirty years ago, I took a tramp of several days through the Appalachian Mountains far from railroads and other modern conveniences. On the fifth of July, I stopped at a little village where there had been a shooting affray on the fourth. A group of young men had come from their mountain homes to the village. One of the group pulled out his bottle and passed it around. One after another took a drink. Finally one man in the group declined. He knew that his declination would be interpreted as an insult. In fact, he so intended it; and kept his eye on the owner of the bottle. The owner reached for his gun, but the young man who had declined got his gun first and shot the owner of the bottle through. That is one way of resenting an insult, but our souls revolt from such a way. Shall we resent an insult by any form of physical force? Jesus answers that question with an emphatic negative.

At the national Democratic Convention in Houston, Texas, in 1928, a distinguished Methodist bishop from Virginia appeared before the platform committee to plead for a dry plank in the Democratic platform. In the course of his argument, he referred to the liquor

situation in Maryland, whereupon a politician from Maryland called him a liar and rushed towards him as if to strike him. Those present intervened, and there was no little confusion. A reporter, who was not at all in sympathy with the prohibition views of the bishop, drew an unforgettable picture of the scene. After picturing the advance of the politician upon the bishop and the confusion that followed, the reporter continued: "The bishop remained in his place, paper in hand, as calm as a Roman judge. As the fighting came to a stop, audience as well as actors breathless, the bishop resumed his argument as though nothing had happened." Whether you like his politics or not, the bishop looms larger in that picture than if he had entered into a fist fight. There is a finer way of dealing with an insult than by resorting to physical force.

Jesus goes further and teaches that our attitude toward our enemies must not simply be negative and passive. It is not enough to turn the other cheek. It is not enough to refrain from revenge. We must love our enemies. We must pray for them, and we must do them good. There are two ways of dealing with enemies. One way is to kill them off; the other is to win them. The latter is Jesus' way.

If we would follow Jesus' way in dealing with personal enemies, social enemies, racial enemies, and national enemies, it would be a solvent for many problems and the world would be a happier place in which to live.

POVERTY AND CHARITY

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus touches upon the

great problem of poverty and charity. This is such a large subject that it is my purpose to devote a separate lecture to it. But let us pause here long enough to note two or three great principles which Jesus gives in the Sermon on the Mount, to guide us. He says: "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away." When someone asks us for help, we are standing face to face with an opportunity and a responsibility from which we must not turn lightly away. Jesus does not command us to give the identical thing which the needy one asks, but he evidently expects us to do the best possible thing for the person who is asking our help.

Back in the days of the saloons, I met a stranger on the streets of Richmond, who asked me for money to buy a drink of whiskey. I do not understand Jesus to teach that I ought to have given him the money for that purpose. I do understand Him to teach that I was that day brought face to face with an immortal soul, and that it was the will of the Master that I should do the best possible thing for that soul.

Again Jesus says: "When thou doest thine alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." We should never make a parade of our charity. We should not sound the trumpet. It is not good for the giver, and it is not good for the recipient. It is so easy to hurt delicate sensibilities. It is equally easy to make a dependent and a pauper of one who could have been put firmly upon his feet by quiet and tactful methods.

There was a fine old saint in my congregation. At one time he had been financially comfortable, but in

is latter years he lost practically all of his property, nd he, his wife, and their orphan grandchildren came o actual want. The officers of our church wanted to elp him, but they were afraid of offending him. So ney asked me, as his pastor, to pay a visit to his home nd pave the way. The treasurer of the church then ent a check. In a few days I dropped in to see my ld friend. The old man went into his room, got his ible, turned to me and said: "I want to ask you some-ning." I was preparing myself to explain some diffi-ult passage from the Bible. Instead, he opened his ible, and took out the check which the treasurer had ent him, pointed to a word which the treasurer had ritten on the lower left hand corner of the check and aid: "What does that mean?" I looked, and lo, the easurer, for convenience in keeping his accounts, had ritten "Charity"! That was one way of blowing ne trumpet, and it cut my old friend to the heart. magine, if you can, the love, the sympathy and the finite tact which Jesus would have shown in dealing ith a case like that.

LAYING UP TREASURES

The Sermon on the Mount also touches upon the roblem of wealth. Jesus says: "Lay not up for your-elves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth orrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; ut lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." Again e says: "Where your treasure is, there will your eart be also." He reaches the climax when He says: Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

The Bible has so much to say about money and riches that it is my purpose to devote a whole lecture to that subject, but we must pause here long enough to note the lessons which this particular passage has for us.

First of all, wealth has no staying power. Moth and rust corrupt and thieves break through and steal. The writer of the Proverbs says: "Labour not to be rich. . . . Riches suddenly make themselves wings; they fly away as an eagle." Those of us who are older have seen that statement verified again and again. We can recall families who were wealthy and who, as time went by, were reduced to actual want. The Apostle John exhorts us not to love the world, nor the things of the world, for the world passeth away. Our possessions are only temporary and transient.

Even if our treasures stay with us, we cannot stay with them. The psalmist tells us that we are soon cut off and fly away. When we go, we will leave everything behind. Two men were driving past a handsome estate whose owner had recently died. One said to the other: "How much did he leave?" The other one replied: "Man, he left it all!" So it will be with all of us.

The Sermon on the Mount also teaches that the man who possesses riches does it at the peril of his soul. Our hearts are apt to be where our treasures are. We cannot serve God and mammon. John Wesley said: "Money never stays with me. I fling it out of my hand as soon as possible, lest it should find a way into my heart." Do not understand from this statement that John Wesley was a spendthrift, or that he was reckless

with money. He lived simply and invested every penny that he could spare in the work of the Lord.

Dr. F. H. Gaines, the founder of Agnes Scott College, once told me the story of its founding. He was pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Decatur, Georgia, just outside of Atlanta. Col. Scott was an elder in the church. One day Col. Scott came to Dr. Gaines' study and said in substance: "I have begun to make money and it frightens me. I am afraid it will harden my heart." He had come to consult with his pastor as to the best way of investing his money for the Lord. They decided that there was great need of a Christian school for girls. Col. Scott drew a handsome check, and with that the pastor and the elder began the school which has grown into Agnes Scott College, a great and living memorial to Col. Scott's mother.

Jesus tells us that we should use our earthly treasures in a way that will lay up treasures in heaven. The only way I know of using money so as to lay up treasures in heaven is to invest it in something that is going to heaven. The only things which we are sure are going to heaven are immortal souls. The man who invests his money in the redemption and development of immortal souls is thereby laying up treasures in heaven. There is nothing more important for the Christian than getting a Christian conception of the acquisition and use of money.

THE GOLDEN RULE

As Jesus came towards the close of His Sermon on the Mount, He gathered together all the social teach-

ings of the sermon and all the social teachings of the Bible and bound them together into one comprehensive, unforgetable sentence, which the world has happily called The Golden Rule. As I near the limit of time and space allotted to this lecture, I find it impossible even to touch upon all the passages in the Sermon on the Mount which have a social application. A whole book might be written upon the social import of the Lord's Prayer alone. I have had no time to touch upon the social import of those pregnant statements: "Ye are the salt of the earth," and "Ye are the light of the world." I have also passed over what Jesus said about perjury and profanity, about anxiety and worry, about sitting in judgment on others, and quite a number of other subjects, all of which have a social import.

But we must not pass over the Golden Rule, as it includes all that I have omitted, and a great deal more. Let us turn and read it again: "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

What does Jesus mean when He says: "For this is the law and the prophets?" Perhaps I can illustrate this from a boyhood experience. When I was a small boy, I attended an old-fashioned country school. It was the custom for the teacher, on the first day of the session, to read a long list of rules, telling us the things which we could do and could not do, especially the things which we could not do. We must not fight, not use bad language, nor throw stones at each other, not do a thousand and one other things which small boys are likely to do. It was a great list. After these rules

were read by the teacher, they were posted on the bulletin board. But alas! small boys could not read writing and they could not remember the long list of detailed rules. One year a new teacher came. He was an elderly man, with a benevolent face. On the first day of school, he arose without any manuscript in his hand and said: "I have only one rule and it contains only two words. This is the rule: 'Do right.'" That teacher gathered up in these two short words all the rules of all the teachers who went before him. This is precisely what Jesus has done in the Golden Rule. He has summarized in one sentence all the ethical teachings of the Old Testament law and of the Old Testament prophets.

Five hundred years before Jesus was born, Confucius taught that we should not do to others what we would not have others do to us. That is fine as far as it goes, but it is negative. In the Apocryphal Book of Tobit, we find this rule: "What thou thyself hatest, do to no man." That, too, is negative. *David Harum,* a delicious book of a generation ago, gives this version of the Golden Rule: "Do to the other fellow as he would like to do to you, and do it first." That is the rule of unregenerate human nature. When left to our own devices, we are very apt to follow that rule.

The Golden Rule of Jesus is positive and comprehensive. It includes all the social teachings of the Bible. It is applicable to every relationship of life. Jesus expects us to live by it in the home, in the school, in the community, in the social circle, in the church, in business, in industrial life, and in national and inter-

national affairs. He expects us to practice it toward all men of all classes, all races, all creeds, and all colours. If it were truly practiced, it would solve the vast majority of our social problems.

But Christians have not taken the Golden Rule seriously enough. The preachers have not preached upon it, and the people have not practiced it. One day a senior in the theological seminary came to me and told me that he was in a bad fix. I asked him to tell me about it. He told me that his presbytery had asked him to preach his trial sermon on the Golden Rule, a very unusual thing, and that he had searched the seminary library, with its thirty thousand volumes, from top to bottom, and had not been able to find any adequate discussion of the Golden Rule, and that he did not know where to begin with his sermon. I told him to begin right there. He said: "Right where?" I told him to begin with his experience, and tell how he had searched a great theological library, with its thirty thousand volumes, and its great wealth of material; and had not been able to find an adequate discussion of the Golden Rule, and make the point that the Golden Rule had evidently been sadly neglected by preachers and commentators in the past.

I note that, in his *Sociology of the Bible,* Dr. Ferdinand S. Schenck had a very similar experience. At a large meeting of ministers in New York City a number of years ago, he asked if any of them had ever preached a sermon on the Golden Rule and applied it to the conduct of big business. None of them had ever done so, and none of them had ever heard a sermon of

that kind. He went back to his own theological seminary and searched the large theological library for a sermon of that kind, but found none. His conclusion was that the neglect of the Golden Rule had characterized the preaching of the past hundred years. If preachers do not preach the Golden Rule and apply it to all phases of every-day life, how can we expect men to practice it?

When the late John J. Eagan, of Atlanta, became president of the American Cast Iron and Pipe Company of Birmingham, he and his directors decided that they would try to run the business of this large concern according to the Golden Rule. They did not intend to give publicity to the fact, but somehow the newspapers got hold of it, and published it all over the United States. Mr. Eagan, in speaking to me about it, said: "The thing that grieves me most is that the newspapers should have considered it news." It ought not to have been. The unusual is news. It ought not to be unusual for Christians to observe the Golden Rule and the teachings of Jesus in business and in all of life's relationships.

PUTTING FIRST THINGS FIRST

Thus we have touched upon some of the high places of the Sermon on the Mount. It has not been possible, in one lecture, even to mention all of its great teachings. But these are sufficient to show that, in this one sermon, Jesus has given fundamental principles, which are applicable to practically all of our modern, social problems.

And now, what is the conclusion of the whole matter? Jesus tells us in these words: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." But what does that mean? In answering the question, let us remember that the Sermon on the Mount is a sermon on the Kingdom of God, and let us also remember that we saw in the preceding chapter that the Kingdom of God on earth is the reign of God in the hearts and lives of men. To seek first the Kingdom of God means that we are to give it the first place in our thoughts and in our plans and purposes. First of all, we must seek to establish His Kingdom, or His reign, in our own hearts and lives. Then we must seek to establish it in the heart and life of every human being on this globe. We must also seek to establish it in all the relationships of life. We must also seek to establish the kind of righteousness that Jesus wants. He demands of His followers a finer and higher type of righteousness than that of the scribes and Pharisees. He is not willing to accept a mere external ritualism for personal and social righteousness. The Sermon on the Mount defines the kind of righteousness which He expects us to seek. His Kingdom and His kind of righteousness must have the first place in our lives.

The Christian business man must put the Kingdom of God and His righteousness first in his business. His first and only aim should not be that of making the largest possible profits. He must think first of the men and women who are in his employ, and the men and women whom he serves through his business. It is of more importance to Jesus that the Christian business

man should make men and women than that he should make large dividends. The Christian business man should think of his business as his way of advancing the Kingdom of God. So it is with all callings in life. No matter what our calling may be, Jesus expects us to put the Kingdom of God and His righteousness first.

In the concluding part of the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus emphasizes the fact that it is infinitely more important that we should do the will of God in our daily lives than that we should make loud professions and go through certain religious rites on the Sabbath. The first part of the sermon gives a picture of the kind of man the Christian ought to be in his inward life. The last part of the sermon gives a picture of the Christian in action, seeking to do the will of God in every department of his life. If men everywhere in all the callings of life would seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, what manner of world would this be!

IV

THE BIBLE AND MONEY

THE love of money probably creates more social problems than any other single cause. It lies back of war, of industrial strife, of the liquor traffic, of the white slave trade, and of commercialized vice of all kinds. You will recall that the Apostle Paul says that the love of money is the root of every kind of evil.

The accumulation of vast wealth into the hands of a comparatively few individuals and corporations creates many other social problems. America is to-day the richest nation that ever had its being upon this planet. In America, wealth has become concentrated into the hands of comparatively few individuals and corporations, in a way that the world has never seen before. When we look up statistics on this subject, they are simply staggering. We might give page after page of such statistics, but they would become obsolete within a year. When I look at the statistics which I gathered on this subject ten years ago and compare them with the statistics of this year, they look as if they might be a hundred years old, so rapidly are we moving. The wealth of our country is growing by leaps and bounds. Not only so, but it is moving so rapidly into the hands of a few individuals and corporations that it makes one dizzy.

This vast wealth is producing a large crop of social problems. First of all, it is producing an idle rich class, which is a problem in itself, and which creates many other problems. But more than this, the accumulation of wealth into the hands of a few enables the few to control, to a large extent, the money markets, prices, wages, labour, politics, and the very souls of men. It also creates widespread social unrest.

In one of the art galleries of Munich, there is a picture which portrays most vividly the mad and ruthless way in which one who has his whole heart set on money drives rough-shod through the world. Here is a description of the picture by Harry Earl Montgomery in his book, *Christ's Social Remedies:* "It depicts a narrow highway along which is rolling a golden coin, surmounted by a shadowy, beckoning, graceful figure. The road is crowded with men and women who are rushing madly after the golden coin; their eyes are aflame with eagerness and their faces are drawn with intense desire; on a galloping horse rides a man whose eyes are fixed upon the rolling coin; whose body is bent over the neck of his steed, and whose thoughts are focussed on the wealth ahead. Clinging to him is his wife; who, with love, devotion, anxiety and fear written on her face, is endeavouring to remain close to her husband. But he, in his eagerness to obtain the coveted gold, is unconsciously, unwittingly, and roughly pushing her from him as he feels that she is becoming a drag upon him in his race for wealth. He appears to be oblivious of the men and women in his path, and is urging his horse onward toward the golden goal,

trampling upon all who are in his way and leaving behind him a line of broken, bleeding, crushed men and women."

JESUS AND MONEY

Has Jesus much to say about money? Perhaps I can answer that best by telling a little incident. While I was still a very young minister, I had the privilege one day of talking with Dr. Josiah Strong, the distinguished writer and speaker on social and religious questions. During the conversation, he said: "If I were a young minister, taking charge of a church, I would preach every Sunday morning and every Sunday evening for three months on the subject of money, and then I would expect the greatest revival that my church had ever known." After a little he added: "You know Jesus had more to say about money, directly or indirectly, than He had to say on any other single subject."

I have thought of that conversation many times since. As a young minister, I wondered where in all the Bible he would be able to find enough texts on that subject to keep him going every Sunday morning and every Sunday night for three months. That question has ceased to perplex me, for as I have studied the Gospels more closely, I have become convinced that Dr. Strong was right when he said that Jesus had more to say, directly or indirectly, about money than He had to say on any other single subject. Let us see.

In the majority of the parables, Jesus used money for illustrative purposes. Think over the parables and see how largely the money element is used. There are

the parables of: The Talents, The Pounds, The Hid Treasure, The Goodly Pearl, The Unmerciful Servant, The Labourers in the Vineyard, The Householder, The Two Debtors, The Rich Fool, The Rich Man and Lazarus, The Wise Steward, The Unjust Steward, The Lost Coin, and The Unprofitable Servants.

Even in the parable of the Good Samaritan, money plays a considerable part. The lone traveller was beaten by the robbers for his money. The Good Samaritan paid the innkeeper money to care for the wounded man. In that pearl of all the parables, the Prodigal Son, money has a large place. The Prodigal took his father's money and went into a far country and spent it in riotous living. Thus money seems to play a part in nearly all of the parables.

Money is involved in a number of striking historical incidents which are related in the Gospels. Money looms large in the story of the Rich Young Ruler, and in the story of Zacchæus, and in the story of Judas. Money lies at the centre of the beautiful story of the widow and her two mites.

In addition to these parables and stories, Jesus had many things to say about money, and some of these sayings are positively startling. In the sixth of Luke, He cries: "Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation." In the sixth of Matthew, He says: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through

nor steal." In the tenth of Mark, He says: "How hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!" In the eighteenth of Luke, He says: "It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." These are but samples of the many things which Jesus has to say about money and about wealth.

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Before going right to the heart of the teachings of Jesus about money, it may be well to make some general observations.

1. Jesus nowhere makes the possession of money, or of wealth, a wrong or a sin. There is a place for the private ownership of property in the teachings of Jesus, and in the teachings of the Bible. Abraham was a wealthy man for his day, but he was called the friend of God. Matthew tells us that Joseph of Arimathæa was a rich man, and that he was a disciple of Jesus. There seemed to be no distinction between the rich and the poor in the thinking of Jesus. To Him, they were all immortal souls, made in the image of God, immortal souls who needed salvation.

2. Jesus did teach that the possession of wealth is a very distinct peril to the soul. He said: "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Again He said: "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." His most startling saying is: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God."

In commenting upon passages like these in his

Christianity and the Social Crisis, Rauschenbusch makes some very interesting remarks. He says: "It gives a touch of cheerful enjoyment to exegetical studies to watch the athletic exercises of interpreters when they confront these sayings of Jesus about wealth. They find it almost as hard to get around the needle's eye as the camel would find it to get through. The resources of philosophy have been ransacked to turn the 'camel' into an anchor-rope, and Oriental antiquarian lore has been summoned to prove that the 'needle's eye' was a little rear-gate of the Oriental house, through which the camel, by judiciously going down on its knees, could work its way. There is a manifest solicitude to help the rich man through. There has not been a like fraternal anxiety for the Pharisee; he is allowed to swallow his camel whole. In the case of the parable of the unjust steward, there are something like thirty-six different interpretations on record. They differ so widely in their allegorical explanations that we are left in doubt if the lord of the steward is God or the devil. Yet the parable seems simple if one is not afraid of breaking crockery by handling it as Jesus did."

By these hard sayings, Jesus does not mean to shut the door in the face of the rich. But He does mean to tell them that they hold their riches at the peril of their own souls. It is so easy to turn from the worship of God to the worship of mammon. It is so easy for the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches to choke out of the human heart the good seed of the Word.

3. Jesus does not measure a man by his money. He tells us that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Life is something finer than stocks and bonds and banks and warehouses. It is even finer than gold. A man may be poor in this world's goods, and at the same time rich toward God. The finest Christian characters which adorn the pages of church history were not rich men.

4. Jesus looks at the way in which we get our money. He tells us that some of the religious leaders of His time got their money by devouring widows' houses. James, the half-brother of Jesus, tells us that there were people in his day who got their riches by withholding the wages of the men who reaped down their fields.

5. Jesus also takes note of the way in which we use our money. We are told that on one occasion, He stood over against the treasury and observed the rich casting in their offerings out of their abundance, and that He saw the poor widow cast in her two mites, which was all of her living. In the parable of the talents, we are distinctly taught that one day He will require us to give an account of the way in which we have used our money and all of our talents. We may be sure that He is interested in three vital questions: What have you got? How did you get it? What are you doing with it?

THIS IS GOD'S WORLD

The fundamental teaching of the Bible about money is that no man has anything that he can call his own in fee simple. There is no truth which the Bible emphasizes more than this. We and all that we have belong

to God. That truth is taught in the first verse in the Bible: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The universe is His. He made it. This same truth is even more beautifully and comprehensively taught in the Twenty-fourth Psalm: "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas and established it upon the floods." With many more such striking passages, He lays claim to us and all that we have.

Lest we might not fully understand these comprehensive statements, God goes through our earthly possessions, and puts His hand on each one and reminds us that it belongs to Him. Back in Leviticus He says: "The land is mine." That embraces all the real estate and all the natural resources in all the world.

The Prophet Haggai brings us this message from Him: "The silver is mine and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts." That includes all the gold and silver and money in all the earth.

In the fiftieth Psalm we have this message: "Every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills." Those words were at first spoken to a shepherd nation, whose chief possessions consisted in flocks and herds. When He laid His hand upon their cattle, He laid it upon their capital. It is interesting to note that the very word "capital" is derived from the Latin word "*caput*," which means a head, the reference being to the number of head of cattle which a man owned. In those days a man's cattle were his capital.

In First Corinthians the Lord lays His hand upon us,

body and soul, and says: "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are his." We are not our own, and we have nothing that we can call our own in fee simple. This is God's world.

In the eighth chapter of Deuteronomy we are told that any ability which a man may have to make money is a gift from God. He warns His people when they become rich not to say: "My power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth." "But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God: for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth." There is no such thing as a self-made man. To begin with, every man is dependent upon hundreds and thousands of other people for his success. To end with, any gift that he may have, including the gift to make money, is from God. If only those who profess to be Christians would acknowledge God's complete ownership of them and all that they have, and would act accordingly, it would revolutionize the business world and solve many social problems.

IN TRUST

The things which we have been calling our own are not our own, after all. They belong to God. We simply hold them in trust for Him. That fact is illustrated in the parable of the talents and in the parable of the pounds. The master did not give his servants the talents in fee simple. They held them in trust to be used for the master, and they had to render an account to him upon his return. We hold these possessions in

trust for Him until He returns, and then we must give an account to Him.

We hold much more than money in trust for Him. The Apostle Paul writes to the Thessalonians: "We were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel." That is the most priceless of all the Master's treasures. The Apostle Peter tells us that we are "stewards of the manifold grace of God." If we have not lost the sense of wonder, we will marvel at statements like those.

USING THE LORD'S MONEY IN BUSINESS

In what ways may the Christian use the Lord's money? That is a question which cuts deep. As I search the Scriptures, I find three ways of using it which meet with His approval.

First of all, we can use it out in the regular channels of business. When the servants received the talents, they did not proceed at once to give them all away. They invested them. The servant who hoarded his Lord's money was severely rebuked and told that he might at least have put it into a bank, in order that it might get into circulation and thus work for the master and do good.

There are many other intimations that Jesus did not expect all of His followers to sell all that they had and to give their money all away. If all were to sell, who would buy? He expected them to use some of His money out in the business world. But we must never forget that the money which is in business is just as much His as that which we put into the collection plate on Sunday. The idea is all too prevalent that if we will

put the Lord's tenth into the collection plate on Sunday, we may use our own nine-tenths as we please during the week. Not so. It all belongs to Him. That, too, is an idea that cuts deep if we follow out its good and necessary inferences.

1. If the money which we invest in business really belongs to the Lord, then we must invest it in a business which He can approve and use and bless.

Back in the days of the saloons, a minister was invited to take tea in a home connected with his church. He discovered soon after his arrival that he was invited to act as umpire between a husband and wife in a business matter. They owned some business property which was vacant. A saloon keeper offered to rent it at a higher rate than they had ever received. The husband was in favour of accepting the saloon keeper's offer. The wife felt that their property belonged to the Lord, and that the Lord could not bless and use the saloon. The minister quickly approved of the wife's position, but it was all to no purpose. The property was rented for saloon purposes. The months went by. The next man summoned to that home was not a minister, but a policeman. The husband began to come home violently drunk, and his wife had to appeal to the police department for protection. The next man called to the home was the minister. It was the husband who asked him to come. His wife had left him, and he wanted the minister to use his good offices to persuade her to come back. When the minister appealed to the wife, she said that when her husband got drunk,—something which was occurring more and more fre-

quently—he was violent, and that she was in mortal fear of him. The breach was irremediable. The Master could not use the saloon, but the Devil could, and did. The Christian is under obligation to invest the Lord's money in a business that the Lord can use. We may be quite sure that He does not want it in a wicked or useless business.

2. If the Christian is using the Lord's money in business, he must use business methods which the Lord can bless and use. I rejoice to believe that the great majority of Christian business men do use methods that the Lord can bless. I am thinking now of a business man who is a very active member of the Episcopal Church. One day a fellow-member of his church told me with distress that my Episcopal friend was dropping a good deal of his church work, and suggested that it might be helpful if I, a Presbyterian, would speak to him about the matter.

The next time I saw my friend, I told him that I was sorry to hear that he was dropping his Christian work. As quick as a flash, he replied that he was doing no such thing. He then went on to tell me that he had caught a new conception of his business. He had come to realize that he was using the Lord's money in his business, and that this had changed his whole conception of his business and its responsibilities. He now realized that he must run his business according to Christian principles. He also realized that he had a Christian duty to perform towards every man who worked for him, and that he had a Christian duty towards every customer. This new conception was

taking more time, as he was trying to organize and conduct his business along lines which were entirely Christian. Then he told me that he had dropped some of his church work. It dawned upon him that just a few people in that large church were doing most of the work. He had therefore asked that some of his work be transferred to other shoulders, while he kept what he considered a reasonable share. And then he added: "But I submit that I have not dropped my Christian work; I have just begun it."

There are still some Christian men in business who have not caught that vision. They are not thinking in terms of Christian service or of human life, but only in terms of profits. Every minister has probably heard some member of his church boast of some business transaction which yielded large profits, but the transaction looked rather doubtful to the minister. Of course the business man did not consider it doubtful, or he would never have told his minister. The trouble is with the ethics of a man like that. He needs to know more of the mind of Christ.

3. If it is the Lord's money which the Christian is using in business, then he must pay a wage that the Lord can approve. We are too apt to let the wage scale be determined by the laws of political economy, and not by the teachings of Christ. A distinguished educator was telling me some time ago that when he and his wife first went to housekeeping, more than thirty years ago, they employed a coloured woman to cook for them. She was a widow with rent to pay and several small children to support. They paid her the

munificent sum of one dollar and a half a week, and wondered why she carried home food which was left over in the kitchen and pantry. After telling me this little incident, my friend said: "I do not see now how I could ever have been a party to any such arrangement as that."

There is a head of a chain of five-and-ten-cent stores who is reputed to have given twenty-five millions of dollars to philanthropy. Not long ago he gave a half million to a great enterprise at one time. At the same time he was deeply interested in raising a large sum for the erection of a girls' home in one of our great cities. With a view to raising this money, he wrote a letter to a wealthy United States Senator from Michigan, asking for a liberal donation. The senator sent him a check for twenty-five hundred dollars, and along with the check he sent a letter which the head of the five-and-ten-cent stores will probably never forget. One paragraph of the letter reads as follows: "I do not know whether you have daughters, but I do know if you had any you would not want to see them working for $7.52 a week. The report which you gave me as to the wages paid to the girls in the five-and-ten-cent store shows the average wage to be $7.52 a week. If that is the average, what is the minimum? Your company makes lots of money, otherwise it would not be asking $265.00 per share for its common stock. I think that you could do a lot more for girls and women by paying them better wages than you can by subscribing money to rescue them after they have gotten into trouble."

4. If we are using the Lord's money in our business,

then our relationship to those whom we employ must be a Christian relationship. There is a beautiful picture of the relationship of employer to employee back in the book of Ruth. Boaz was a man of means, and evidently employed a considerable number of men to reap down his fields. We are told that he would walk out among his reapers and say: "The Lord be with you." They in turn would reply: "The Lord bless you." It would be a great sight if a modern captain of industry could walk down among the labourers in his great industrial plant and say to them: "The Lord be with you," and get the cheerful response: "And the Lord bless you."

Mr. John S. Huyler was a great Christian, as well as a great manufacturer of candy. His biographer tells us that his relationship to those who worked for him was very beautiful. "His money did not come from the grudging toil of unhappy and slaving workers, but from the cheery co-operation of employees who well knew his friendship for them." One of the workers said: "He was never too busy to have a cheery 'Good-morning' and a kind and encouraging word for the humblest of his people." Another worker gave this testimony: "His heart was always ready to help. But back of all the money help was the question, could he help that man's soul? Every now and then he would come around and say, 'Well, John, how is the family, how are the wife and the little children?' Then the next question would be, 'How close are you to Jesus?'"

These are some of the obligations which rest upon

the man who is using the Lord's money in business. It may all sound ideal, and so it is, but is the idealism of Jesus. If the business world could catch something of this ideal, and put it into actual practice, the conflict between capital and labour, between employer and employee, would be reduced to a minimum, and many other social problems would melt away.

USING THE LORD'S MONEY FOR EXPENSES

In the second place, we may use the Master's money for personal expenses. Our common sense would tell us that. The worker must live. Jesus and His disciples used money in that way. In the eighth chapter of Luke we are told that certain godly women "ministered to him of their substance." They provided money for the personal expenses of Jesus and those with Him. Jesus and His group had a common fund for expenses, and Judas was treasurer.

How much of the Lord's money may we spend on ourselves and our homes? That is an intensely practical question. Some professing Christians feel that they have a right to spend an unlimited amount. In their thinking, it is their own money, and why should they not spend as much as they please on themselves? They forget that it is the Lord's money. It is just as much His money as the money they drop into the collection plate on Sunday.

There is a paragraph in Ecclesiastes which sounds very modern. It describes the extravagant and riotous way in which some people spend money upon themselves, and in the end shows how little real satisfaction

they get out of it. Here is the paragraph with a few phrases omitted: "I builded me houses, I planted me vineyards, I made me gardens and parks, and I planted trees in them of all kinds of fruit, I made me pools of water, I bought me men-servants and maid-servants and had servants born in my house, I got me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, musical instruments and that of all sorts. So I was great and increased more than all that were before me in Jerusalem. Whatsoever mine eyes desired, I kept not from them. I withheld not my heart from any joy. Then I looked on all the works that my hands had wrought, and behold all was vanity and a striving after the wind, and there was no profit under the sun."

When we see Christians lavishing so much upon themselves and their homes, the question becomes insistent as to how much of the Lord's money they have a right to use in that way. Perhaps we can arrive at an answer by a very simple illustration.

It has been the good custom of the Church for many years to give financial assistance to young men who are studying for the ministry, if they need it. When the Church thus assists the young candidate for the ministry, how is he expected to use the money? Certainly the Church does not expect him to live on cheese and crackers or in a miserly way. On the other hand, the Church does not expect him to spend it on useless luxuries. The Church expects him to use that money in a way that will enable him to be the most effective student that it is possible for him to be.

You pay your minister a salary. How shall he use it? You do not expect him to live in a log hut, or to wear threadbare clothes, or to look like a hay-seed. On the other hand, you do not expect him to spend his money on gay clothing, expensive jewellery, handsome automobiles, and extravagant living. There is a golden mean somewhere between these two extremes. You expect him to use his money in a way that will enable him to be the most effective minister that it is possible for him to be.

In the same way, the Christian should use the Lord's money for expenses in a way that will enable him to be the most effective worker in the Kingdom of God that it is possible for him to be. This principle cuts deep. It would bring the standard of Christian living more into keeping with the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus. It would set free much of the Lord's money for the work of the kingdom. The great missionary and educational enterprises of the Church would no longer languish for lack of money. It would allay much of the present-day social unrest.

USING THE LORD'S MONEY FOR CHURCH WORK

In the third place, we see the New Testament Christians putting some of the Lord's money into the treasury of the Lord's house. Jesus not only approved of the poor widow who put her two mites into the Lord's treasury, but He immortalized her. The Christian should use some of the Lord's money for the great Christian and philanthropic enterprises of the kingdom. When the preacher arrives at this point in the

discussion of money, there are some hearers who have a tendency to react as a Methodist steward did when John Wesley preached his notable sermon on money. When Wesley announced his first head: "Make all you can," the steward uttered a hearty, "Amen!" When Wesley announced his second head: "Save all you can," the steward shouted: "Praise the Lord!" When Wesley announced his third head: "Give all you can," the steward groaned: "Spoiled it all." I trust that this is not your reaction.

How much should the Christian give? The Old Testament writers taught that God's people should give a tithe. From the records, we would not judge that the Jewish people practiced the tithe law very diligently. In fact, there are intimations in the prophets that the people were very lax about it. You will recall that notable passage in Malachi where the prophet exclaims: "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings."

Is the Old Testament tithe law binding upon Christians? There are many able ministers and teachers who believe that it is. I have studied the question with all the care of which I am capable, but I remain unconvinced. Not only so, but I cannot help feeling that this position tends too much toward Judaistic legalism. It is not possible to give here all the details of the study which have led me to this conclusion. Besides, it would carry us afield from the subject under discussion.

However, I do not mean to say for a moment that the Old Testament tithe law has no value for the Chris-

tian Church. It has much value in every way. If it is not a law for the Christian, it certainly holds before him a great principle to guide him in his giving. Let us see.

We are taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the new dispensation is more glorious than the old. Even though the tithe may not be a binding law, surely those living under the new and more glorious dispensation should not give any less than those who lived under the old and less glorious dispensation. Not only so, but in the New Testament we have a Great Commission to preach the Gospel to every creature. There was no such explicit commission in the Old Testament. Jesus knew that it would require money to pay expenses in the carrying out of this Great Commission, and surely He does not expect us to give less than the Old Testament saints who had no such commission. If this line of argument is correct, and we believe it is, then Christians should certainly not give less than the tithe, and some should give much more.

There are a large number of examples of Christian giving in the New Testament. In the sixteenth chapter of First Corinthians, Paul exhorts them to give as the Lord has prospered them. In the eighth chapter of Second Corinthians, we are told that the Macedonians gave up to and even beyond their ability. In the eighteenth chapter of Luke we hear Zacchæus saying that he was going to give half of all his goods. In the twelfth chapter of Mark we see the poor widow casting in all her living. In the fourth chapter of Acts we see Christians selling their lands and houses in order that

they might have money to give. All of these are inspiring examples of Christian giving.

It may be that the Lord intended that different people should follow different standards of giving, according to their circumstances. The United States income tax law is an illustration of what I am trying to say. According to that law, those citizens who have a comparatively small income pay a small percentage of it as income tax, while those who have a large income pay a very much larger percentage. If we take the tithe as a principle and not as a law, our conclusion would be that the Christian with a small income should give not less than a tithe, while the Christian with a large income may be under obligation to give much more than a tithe.

There are several reasons for Christian giving. One reason is that the Lord can use our gifts for the advancement of His kingdom. Another is that it is good for our own souls. Jesus told the rich young ruler to sell all that he had and give to the poor. He saw that gold had become enthroned in that winsome young man's heart. It was necessary for him to take the god of gold off the throne before he could enter the kingdom. Jesus intimates that the same thing is true of many others when He tells us how hard it is for a rich man to enter the kingdom.

A number of years ago, a board, of which I was a member, thought of undertaking to raise a large sum of money. We accordingly sent for a man who had been successful in raising large sums for Christian enterprises. We told him what was in our minds. When we

concluded, he sat very quietly and said nothing for several moments. Then he began slowly: "I love to raise money." I said in my heart, let me turn aside now and see this great sight. He continued: "For that is my way of helping to—" My mind ran ahead and I thought that he was going to say that was his way of helping to build churches, colleges, theological seminaries, and Y. M. C. A.'s. But that was not what he said. Here is what he said: "I love to raise money, for that is my way of helping to save the souls of men, for I am persuaded that there are many people who will have to be separated from some of their money before they can be saved." That is exactly what Jesus told the rich young ruler. It is probably true of many people to-day.

CONCLUSION

The Christian is faced with a threefold problem when it comes to the use of money. How much of the Lord's money shall I invest in business? How much shall I spend on myself and my home? How much shall I give to Christian and philanthropic enterprises? These questions must be faced together and not singly. No man can answer them for another. The faithful steward will find the answer in his room when the door is shut and he is alone with the Lord.

A Christian conception and a Christian use of money would cure many of the world's social ills. What will be the place of money when the kingdom has fully come and when the will of God is done on earth as it is in heaven? That is the place which the Christian should try to give it now.

V

THE BIBLE AND POVERTY

MOSES said: "The poor shall never cease out of the land." Jesus said: "Ye have the poor with you always." Were they expressing a necessity or a simple fact? At any rate, the problem of poverty is an age-long problem and is still with us. The world is becoming richer and a more comfortable place in which to live, and yet poverty persists. It is difficult to say which creates more social problems, extreme wealth or extreme poverty. The two are intimately related.

THE EXTENT OF POVERTY

The extent of poverty in this enlightened twentieth century is appalling. Robert Hunter, in his book on poverty, a few years ago, estimated that twenty per cent of the population of Boston, that centre of culture, are in actual distress. In the same book he states that fourteen per cent of the families in Manhattan Borough, New York, are evicted annually for non-payment of rent, and that ten per cent of all those who die in Manhattan are buried as paupers. Those figures could probably be duplicated in all the large cities of America. In the congested areas of our cities and in the remote sections of our country districts there is more poverty in this favoured land of ours than those of us who live in comfortable homes have ever dreamed of.

If this is the condition in America, the most favoured land in all the world, what must it be in some other lands. Friends who have visited the Orient tell us that we do not know what poverty means. On the front page of to-day's paper we are told that there are several million people in China facing death by starvation. There are millions in China, Korea, Japan, Russia, Africa, the Near East, and other lands who go to bed hungry every night. Charles Booth estimates that in the city of London, that great financial centre, thirty per cent of the people are in need. Whole books have been written on the extent of poverty in the world, and they have not exhausted the subject.

This great multitude of poor people in all lands are suffering untold miseries. Not only so, but they create many social problems. Moreover, the problem of providing for these dependent classes constitutes a large problem and a heavy burden for a great many cities and communities. In our beautiful city of Richmond, with its culture and wealth, the community chest amounts to more than a half million dollars annually. Did you ever think of the meaning of those figures? They mean that it takes a half million dollars annually to provide a minimum support for those agencies and those institutions which are ministering to dependent people. If you want to get some idea of the extent of poverty in your own city, ask one of the city missionaries or study the work of the Associated Charities. The extent of poverty in the world is so vast that it is beyond our comprehension.

THE CAUSES OF POVERTY

Any thoughtful man will inquire at once as to the causes of all this age-long and world-wide poverty. If we were to give a simple catalogue of all the causes without any comment it would make a very long list. Their name is legion. But it may be well to mention a few of the outstanding causes. I will begin with those that are mentioned in the Bible, as we are dealing with the social and ethical teachings of the Bible.

War, famine, and pestilence were the three things which were most dreaded back in the Bible times. They are usually linked together by the prophets. They caused more death and misery and poverty than all the other causes combined.

Perhaps war has caused more of the poverty and suffering which are found in the world to-day than any other single cause. Some of us were brought up in the midst of the poverty caused by the Civil War. There are millions of people in Europe and Asia to-day who are suffering from even greater poverty caused by the World War.

Famines, caused by protracted droughts, were frequent in Palestine and often brought the whole population face to face with starvation. This type of poverty was caused by forces of nature over which the people had no control. The forces of nature are still causing much poverty in all parts of the world. If you will think a moment of the Mississippi floods, the West Indian storms, the droughts in China, and the earthquakes in Japan you will understand what I am trying to say.

Pestilence, or sickness, has caused much of the world's poverty. Sickness and death create large expense items. Not only so, but sickness and death often lay the bread-winner low, and those who were dependent upon him may quickly become dependent upon the community.

The Bible refers to industrial oppression as a source of poverty. All through the Bible it is intimated that the rich often grind the face of the poor. Read the short book of Amos and see how much he has to say on this subject. James intimates that the rich often withhold the wages of those who work for them. It is not an uncommon thing to see those who furnish the capital roll in wealth while those who provide the labour suffer for the very necessities of life.

Unemployment is another cause of poverty. Jesus, in one of His parables, tells us that when a certain householder went down into the market-place and found men standing idle he asked: "Why stand ye here all the day, idle?" They replied: "Because no man hath hired us." There are multitudes of men and women who could make that reply to-day. It may be that their unemployment has resulted from economic conditions or from their own inefficiency, but whatever the cause, prolonged unemployment results in poverty. Over and over again the Bible lists intemperance as a cause of poverty. It remains so to this day. The world's drink bill is something enormous. Men by the thousands spend for intoxicating liquor the money which is needed for the support of their wives and children. Yet there are still those who say that if we will let liquor alone it will let us alone.

Laziness is another cause of poverty which is mentioned in the Bible. The writer of the Proverbs makes merry over the sluggard. But he warns the sluggard in most picturesque language that he is sure to come to poverty. Sometimes a *poor* man is a poor *man*.

And so we might go on at length and add cause after cause, such as, ignorance, mental defectiveness, old age, crime, desertion, immorality, poor judgment, industrial accidents, dangerous occupations, indiscriminate charity, and so forth. A very complete and classified list can be found in any good work on sociology. These causes are interrelated, and frequently several of them will be found back of a given case of poverty. Any remedy for poverty must take into account its causes. But we must hasten on to see what the Bible has to say about poverty and its cure.

THE POOR IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

There is a wealth of material in the Old Testament with reference to the poor. I have collected more than one hundred and seventy-five passages in which reference is made to the poor. There are more than fifty other passages which speak of the fatherless, or the fatherless and the widow, as typical of the defenseless and dependent classes. Besides, there are many other passages which relate to the poor, although the word itself is not used.

The Old Testament champions the cause of the poor. This is all the more remarkable when we remember how little consideration was given to the poor by the surrounding nations in Old Testament times. Pagan

nations have never shown any large consideration for the poor.

In dealing with the poor, the Old Testament laws used both preventive and remedial measures. The land laws which are laid down in the Pentateuch might be termed the greatest preventive measure of all. Dr. Thomas Chalmers, the great Scotch preacher and reformer of nearly a hundred years ago, took the position that much of the poverty in the city and in the country results from bad land laws, by which a comparatively few people are able to lay their hands on large areas of real estate in the city and in the country, thus making it impossible for millions of others to own their own homes.

The Old Testament land laws distributed the land equitably among all the people. Not only so, but the law provided that in the year of Jubilee, which came every fiftieth year, the land should be re-distributed among the people. A Hebrew could not buy land in fee simple or in perpetuity. He could only buy or lease it until the year of Jubilee, and then it reverted to the family of the original owner. There is a suggestion here that God meant the land and the great natural resources of the world for the benefit of all His people, and not simply for a favoured few. This land law was the outstanding measure adopted for the prevention of poverty.

The Sabbatical year was still another measure for the prevention of poverty. Its working is described in the fifteenth chapter of Deuteronomy: "At the end of every seven years thou shalt make a release. And this

is the manner of the release: Every creditor shall release that which he hath lent unto his neighbour: he shall not exact it of his neighbour and his brother; because Jehovah's release hath been proclaimed." As another preventive of poverty the law did not allow a Hebrew to take interest from a fellow-Hebrew, when it was necessary for him to borrow money or food to meet his needs. "He that putteth not out his money to interest," is a part of the description of the ideal man in the Fifteenth Psalm.

As another preventive of poverty, the rich are warned again and again not to oppress the poor or in any way take advantage of them. Tolstoi used to say that the rich are willing to do anything for the poor but to get off of their backs. The law and the prophets warn the rich again and again to keep off of the backs of the poor.

There were quite a number of remedial measures for poverty provided in the Old Testament. Individuals are urged to be kind and helpful to the poor. Besides there were a number of laws which made it the duty of the whole body politic to help the poor. In the fifteenth of Deuteronomy all the people were commanded to bring in a tithe every three years for the support of the fatherless and widows, and at the same time for the support of the Levites, who had no land.

In the twenty-third chapter of Exodus provision is made for all the land and all vineyards and olive orchards to rest every seventh year, and one reason for this resting was "that the poor of the people may eat" of the volunteer crops which grow that year.

Still another provision is recorded in the twenty

fourth chapter of Deuteronomy: "When thou reapest thy harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the sojourner, for the fatherless, and for the widow." The same rule was to apply to their vineyards and olive orchards.

At almost every turn in the Old Testament law we meet some provision for the poor, until we find it all summed up in one royal law: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." There is no book in all the world which shows more thought and consideration for the poor than the Old Testament. And at the end of its poor laws we find this significant statement: "Howbeit there shall be no poor with thee if only thou diligently hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all this commandment which I command thee this day."

It is difficult to know just how diligently the Hebrew people observed all these laws concerning the poor during all the centuries of their history. We do know that the psalmists, prophets and teachers of Israel ever kept these ideals before the people. No writer has expressed these ideals in a finer way than Job, when in several passages of marvellous beauty, he adduces his attitude toward the poor as the crowning evidence of his innocency. In his twenty-ninth chapter we have this passage: "I delivered the poor that cried, the fatherless also, that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness, and it clothed me: my justice was as a robe and a

diadem. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the needy: and the cause of him that I knew not I searched out."

In his thirty-first chapter we find a passage that is even more suggestive and eloquent: "If I have withheld the poor from their desire, or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail, or have eaten my morsel alone, and the fatherless hath not eaten thereof, if I have seen any perish for want of clothing, or that the needy had no covering; if his loins have not blessed me, and if he hath not been warmed with the fleece of my sheep; if I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless, because I saw my help in the gate: then let my shoulder fall from the shoulder-blade, and mine arm be broken from the bone." It is no wonder that with such laws and such ideals before them in their holy scriptures the Hebrew people have always been noted for their kindness to their poor.

JESUS AND THE POOR

Jesus knew the Scriptures. He had doubtless read again and again all that the Old Testament had to say about the poor. Not only so, but Jesus was brought up in the midst of poverty. If you go to His home city of Nazareth to-day you will see signs of deep poverty on every side. It has probably always been so. Jesus Himself seems to have had no money and to have owned no property. The Son of Man had not where to lay His head. Out of personal experience and observation He was able to enter into the feelings of the poor.

In His first sermon in His home town of Nazareth,

Jesus took for His text a passage from Isaiah which begins as follows: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor."

When John the Baptist sent two of his disciples to Jesus to ask: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Jesus told them to go back and tell John the things which they had seen and heard: "The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." Jesus' ministry to the poor was the crowning proof of His claims to Messiahship. All through His ministry, His heart was touched with deep compassion for the poor.

When you ask what Jesus did for the alleviation and cure of poverty, there is much that can be said.

First of all, He loved the poor. Almsgiving without love is not worth a great deal. The Apostle Paul was expressing the mind of Christ when he said: "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor and have not love, it profiteth me nothing."

Jesus and the apostles had a fund which they used in ministering to the poor. Judas was the treasurer. But there is no record of any specific case where a poor person was actually helped from this fund. Jesus followed His own teachings and did not blow the trumpet or let His left hand know what His right hand was doing when He helped the poor. At the last supper, Jesus said a few words quietly to Judas and then Judas got up and went out. John tells us that the rest of them supposed that Jesus had sent Judas on an errand to

buy something necessary for the supper, or to minister to the poor. Evidently His own disciples did not always know when He helped the poor out of this fund. It was all done so quietly and with such fine tact.

However, Jesus did not seem to stress almsgiving in His teachings. He did tell the rich young ruler to sell all that he had and to give to the poor, but He was probably thinking more about saving the soul of the young man than He was about the poor. The young man was worshipping the god of gold. Jesus tells him to tear down his god of gold and to follow the Christ.

Jesus went deeper than almsgiving, which at best is only an alleviation of poverty. It is certainly no cure. He preached against covetousness and greed. He taught the great principles of love and brotherhood, the great principles of the Golden Rule and stewardship, and other fundamental principles of Christian living which if translated into life and into business principles would do much to banish poverty from the world.

Not only so, but He set us an example by removing the causes of poverty. He opened the eyes of the blind, unstopped the ears of the deaf, cleansed the lepers, cured the sick, and healed the lame. Thus He took men who were dependent upon the community, and transformed them into self-supporting, self-respecting members of society. We cannot perform the miracles which Jesus did, but there are a thousand ways in which we can help to remove the causes of poverty.

In His matchless story of the Good Samaritan, Jesus incidentally suggests some points to be observed in helping people who are in need. First of all we note

that the heart of the Good Samaritan was touched with compassion. The hearts of the priest and the Levite were unmoved. The Good Samaritan got down and ministered to the half-dead man with his own hands, pouring in oil and wine, the best medicines available. The priest and Levite would have been perfectly willing to have reported the case to the Associated Charities at Jerusalem or at Jericho. They preferred to do that kind of work by proxy. The Good Samaritan took the poor, wounded man to the inn, which was the best substitute for a hospital that was available. Even there he continued to minister to him with his own hands as long as it was possible. When he could stay no longer he used his own money in providing for the poor man. Note that he did not give the money directly to the needy man, but to the innkeeper. The fact that a man is in need is often indicative of the fact that he does not know how to make the wisest use of money when he has it. When the Good Samaritan left he planned to return and visit his patient and pay the bills. The secret of the whole story is that his heart was touched with compassion. He loved his neighbour as himself. The very purpose of Jesus in telling the story was to illustrate what that means. Dr. F. B. Meyer, the distinguished British preacher, says:

"I used to live in a little hut on the road between Jericho and Jerusalem, so that I could help travellers who had been beset by thieves. But lately I have moved to Jerusalem itself, and I am hammering away at Caiaphas and Pilate to send a company of soldiers to root out the whole nest of robbers."

THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH AND THE POOR

Shortly after Pentecost, we see a great outburst of Christian giving for the relief of the poor. Christians even went so far as to sell their lands and houses in order to have money to give for this purpose. Some of them went even further and had all things in common. That was a touch of communism. This relief work seems to have been more or less spasmodic and unorganized.

There were practical men among the apostles and we hear them in the sixth chapter of Acts urging the Christians at Jerusalem to put their relief work on an organized basis, by electing seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, to take charge of it. "The saying pleased the whole multitude," and they proceeded at once to elect the seven men. "The seven" were not explicitly called deacons, but there are a good many reasons for believing that they were, and we Presbyterians believe that we have the duties of the deacon's office outlined for us in the sixth chapter of Acts. Incidentally, I may say that if these were not deacons, then we have nowhere in the Bible any intimation as to what the duties of deacons are.

The Apostle Paul was very solicitous for the poor saints in Jerusalem. If you will read the Acts and his Epistles with this in mind, you will see that everywhere, in season and out of season, he was taking up collections for these poor saints at Jerusalem. These collections must have amounted to a very considerable sum at times, for in the fifteenth of Romans we find Paul going all the way from Corinth to Jerusalem to carry this collection personally. Christian charity

formed a large element in the Apostle Paul's applied Christianity. He wrote the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians right out of his own heart's experience.

So we find that the New Testament Church made large provisions for the poor, and that they did it in a systematic and organized way. Men who were full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom were put in charge of this work. It was done by the Church as a corporate body, and not simply by individuals in the Church. It was an expression of genuine Christian love and fellowship.

CHARITY IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Charity in the truest sense of that word was one of the crowning virtues of the early Christian Church. For several centuries after the Apostolic Age the writings of the Church Fathers are rich in references to the love and charity of the early Christians. If we will remember that those early centuries were centuries of poverty and persecutions for the Christians, we will realize that there was a large field for Christian charity, and at the same time we will appreciate all the more the sacrifices which these poor Christians must have made to help each other. Tertullian, who was born about 150 A. D., says in his *Apology:*

"It is our care for the helpless, our practice of loving-kindness, that brands us in the eyes of many of our opponents. 'Only look,' they say, 'look how they love one another. Look how they are prepared to die for one another.'"

At another place in his *Apology* Tertullian says:

"Even if there does exist a sort of common fund, it is not made up of fees, as though we contracted our worship. Each of us puts in a small amount one day a month, or whenever he pleases; but only if he pleases and if he is able, for there is no compulsion in the matter, every one contributing of his own free will. These monies are, as it were, the deposits of piety. They are not expended upon banquets or drinking bouts or thankless eating-houses, but on feeding and burying poor people, on behalf of boys and girls who have neither parents nor money, in support of old folk unable now to go about, as well as for people who are shipwrecked, or who may be in mines or exiled in islands or in prison."

Remember that in those days of persecution Christians were sent to mines, to prisons, and banished to barren islands for the Gospel's sake. Yet they never got beyond the love and care of their fellow-Christians.

Justin Martyr, who suffered martyrdom about 165 A. D., writes in his *Apology:*

"Those who are well-to-do and willing, give as they choose, each as he himself purposes; the collection is then deposited with the president, who helps orphans, widows, those who are in want owing to sickness or any other cause, those who are in prison, and strangers who are on a journey."

These early Christians showed their love and care for each other in times of plagues and pestilence. In Eusebius we find the following account of the terrible plague in Alexandria about the middle of the third century:

"The most of our brethren did not spare themselves, so great was their brotherly affection. They held fast to each

other, visited the sick without fear, ministered to them assiduously, and served them for the sake of Christ. Right gladly did they perish with them. Indeed, many died after caring for the sick and giving health to others, transplanting the death of others, as it were, into themselves. In this way the noblest of our brethren died, including some presbyters and deacons and people of the highest reputation. Quite the reverse was it with the heathen. They abandoned those who began to sicken, fled from their dearest friends, threw out the sick when half dead into the streets, and let the dead lie unburied."

Again in another place Eusebius describes the conduct of the Christians during the great plague which occurred in the reign of Maximinus. He writes:

"The Christians were the only people who amid such terrible ills showed their fellow-feeling and humanity by their actions. Day by day some would busy themselves with attending to the dead and burying them; others gathered in one spot all who were afflicted by hunger throughout the whole city, and gave bread to them all. When this became known, people glorified the Christians' God, and convinced by the very facts, confessed the Christians alone were truly pious and religious."

While these early Christians were noted for their love and charity, they took due precaution lest they should be deceived and imposed upon by imposters. We have an illustration of this in *The Teachings of the Twelve,* which was written some time before the middle of the second century. In one paragraph of this interesting document we find this rule:

"If the comer is a traveller, assist him as ye are able; but let him not stay with you but for two or three days, if

it be necessary. But if he wishes to settle with you, being a craftsman, let him work and eat. But if he has no craft, according to your wisdom provide how without idleness he shall live as a Christian among you. If he will not do this he is trafficking upon Christ. Beware of such men."

At a later date, they required strangers who claimed to be Christians and who asked for charity or hospitality, to show an official passport from their home church.

Thus Christian charity flowed on in one golden stream from century to century. Many more illustrations might be cited. Harnack, in a notable chapter in *The Gospel of Love and Charity,* has collected many of these passages and brought them together in a very fine chapter. I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to him. I have given a sufficient number of illustrations to show how large a place Christian charity occupied in the life of the early Church. It was the crowning grace of the Church during those early centuries.

THE CHURCH TO-DAY AND THE POOR

Having sketched in this brief way the teachings of the Old Testament, of Jesus, of the New Testament Church, and of the early Christian Church, we are prepared to ask: In the light of these teachings, what is the duty of the Church of to-day to the poor, and what can the Church do towards the solution of the social problems caused by poverty?

First of all, the Church should set its face steadfastly against every form of oppression which tends to reduce people to poverty, and to keep them poor. There is

nothing which the Bible denounces with such burning indignation as the oppression of the poor. If we were to quote all of the Biblical passages on this subject, they would fill many pages of a book. As typical of these passages, I will quote just one paragraph from Malachi: "And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against the false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling of his wages, the widow and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts.

In the second place, the Church should do all that lies within her power to remove the causes of poverty. That was Jesus' way, and we should walk in His steps. Not only so, but it is the only real cure for poverty. As long as the law of cause and effect continues to operate, there will be poverty, until the causes of poverty are removed.

In the third place, we should cultivate hearts of love and compassion for those who are in need of any kind. As we read the New Testament, we are struck with the fact that the heart of Jesus was always moved with compassion in the face of need. His love and compassion lay back of everything that He did.

Amos gives us a vivid picture in which he shows how utterly devoid of compassion God's chosen people were in his day. He pictures them as being at ease in Zion and then he says: They "lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst

of the stall: That chant to the sound of the viol. . . . That drink wine in bowls and anoint themselves with the chief ointments, but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph." That description has a very modern sound about it. Many of us who profess to be Christians live in our comfortable homes. Many even live in the greatest luxury. There is poverty all about us, but our hearts are unmoved. We are not grieved for the afflictions of the poor.

The Church should resume her ministry of love and sympathy for the poor. She must do it if she would walk in the steps of Christ. She must do it if she would win the poor for Christ and His Church. She must do it if she would save her own soul.

In recent years, city churches have tended more and more towards turning all relief work over to agencies which lie entirely outside the Church, and which sometimes are even unfriendly to the Church. These agencies have, in turn, so reduced their relief work to science and system that there is very little place left for love and sympathy. Do not misunderstand me. There is a place for these social agencies. There is also a place for the Church. The Church should provide for her own poor and should do it in the name of the Christ, and then the members of the Church should support heartily those social agencies which are ministering to the poor who have no Church connections. We wonder why so many city churches of to-day have so few poor in them. It may be because the Church has ceased to have a heart of love and compassion for the poor.

But how can the Church minister to the poor? She

can do it through the efforts of individual Christians, and through the organized agencies of the Church. Some of the finest service which has ever been rendered in the name of Christ has been the service which individual Christians have rendered to other individuals in the hour of need. This individual method gives a touch of love and sympathy which no other method can ever do.

The Church as an organization should also minister to the poor. One of the finest things which the New Testament Church did after Pentecost was to elect seven men whose duty it was to minister to those in need. They were men full of the Holy Spirit and of faith and of wisdom. All those qualifications were needed for their delicate task, for, after all, it is difficult to help the poor without hurting them. We may hurt their feelings, or may do injury to their spirit of independence and self-help. It is significant to note that after the seven had been elected and had entered upon their service to the poor, the record in Acts says: "And the word of God increased, and the number of disciples multiplied in Jerusalem."

The deacons of the New Testament Church helped the poor. That was their chief business. The deacons of to-day should be the channel through which the churches express their love and service to the poor. Perhaps I can best tell how this can be done in a practical way by taking a leaf out of my own note-book.

While I was pastor in the city of Atlanta, our church had a board of deacons who would have been a joy to any minister's heart. They were eager to do the work

which deacons were elected to do. Among other things, they appointed a special committee whose duty it was to look after the poor of the church. They were men who had love and compassion in their hearts. I could write a whole book on the fine work which they did in the relief of the poor. They not only supplied poor families with food and fuel and the needful things of life, but they did a great deal of constructive work in the way of removing the causes of poverty, and by helping families who were in financial straits, but were not yet on the parish. There is space for only one or two illustrations.

One day I received a beseeching letter from a woman whom I did not know. She said that she was brought up in the Presbyterian Church, and that her husband was a nominal Catholic. About five years before, they had bought a house and an acre of land in a growing suburb, and were paying for it on the installment plan, and had it more than half paid for. The contract was that if they should at any time fail to make three consecutive payments, then all that they had paid should be considered as rental, and the house would revert to the original owners. The husband had lost his job because it was a poor business year, and because he drank. Two payments were overdue and the third was nearly due. They were about to lose their home. Not only so, but it was December and they had neither food nor fuel.

That was her pitiful story. She did not know what could be done, but she had heard that the deacons of our church were kind to people in trouble and she

thought that perhaps they might be able to devise some way to save her home.

I did not know the people. They lived on the other side of the city from me. But I went at once to see them and found everything just as the woman had stated in her letter. I turned the matter over to the deacons. This was the very thing they were elected to do. They went at once, and after studying the case for themselves, advanced the money to pay up the back installments on the house. At the same time, they got a position for the man, who gave his solemn promise that he would drink no more. Prohibition went into effect in Atlanta about that time, and greatly helped him in his resolve.

The home was saved. In a few years, it was fully paid for and had greatly increased in value. The man returned all that the deacons had advanced. He stopped his drinking and he and his wife united with a nearby church and became very active members. The deacons did not wait for this family to become paupers. They went to their aid in distress, saved them from pauperism, and made it possible for them to be self-respecting members of the community, and valuable members of the church.

One day a woman came to my home in great distress. She told me that she had been living in a small town in Georgia, when her husband, who was a Presbyterian elder, died; she saw no way for her and her three young daughters to make a living in the little town, so they had come to Atlanta, and had rented a house far out on West Peachtree, with a view to keeping board-

ers and thus making a living. The boarders never came, and now all her money had gone for rent. What could she and her young daughters do?

I went to the home and found everything just as she had described it. Again I took the matter up with the deacons. They rented a house for her down in the boarding-house section of the city, paid the rent, and then helped her to secure boarders. The daughters went to a business college and in a few months had business positions. When I left Atlanta, the woman had returned to the deacons all the money which they had advanced, and still had a neat sum to her account in the bank. In the meantime, she and her daughters had developed into very earnest and useful Christians.

I might multiply illustrations of this kind, but these are sufficient to illustrate the kind of constructive work that can be done by the Church, if it has a heart of compassion, and if it is organized for service. There needs to be a great revival of the deacon's office and a return to the original function of that office, which was to minister to those in need.

When the Kingdom of God has fully come, and when His will is done on earth as it is done in heaven, what will be the attitude of the Church to the poor? I can confidently assure you that it will not be the attitude which she has to-day. In fact, the real question is this: When the Kingdom of God has fully come, and when His will is done on earth as it is in heaven, will there be any poor? It is my own firm conviction that the practice of the teachings of Jesus Christ would banish poverty from the earth.

VI

THE BIBLE AND THE FAMILY

HERBERT SPENCER was right when he said: "The welfare of the family underlies the welfare of society." The family is the smallest social unit. In fact, it is a miniature social order. It is a training-ground for the larger relationships of life. If the family fails, its failure affects the whole social order. Not only so, but it affects the Church even more.

The family life of America is being sorely tested at this time. There are many forces at work which make it more and more difficult to maintain an ideal home life. The high tension under which the present generation is living, with its automobiles, airplanes, telephones, radios, picture shows, and so forth, leaves very little time for the cultivation of family life. Crowded apartments, hotels, and tenement houses are not conducive to the development of the highest ideals in the family. There seems to be no place in these congested living quarters for the family altar, or the old-fashioned centre-table with its family Bible. The entrance of women into the commercial, industrial, and political world has cut deep into the home life of America. Loose conceptions of the relationship of the sexes, and the liberty and license which have resulted, have struck

a hard blow at the family. The modern revolt of youth, with its attendant demoralization, constitutes one of the most difficult of all the problems which face the American family to-day. Back of all these problems, there is a growing tendency to neglect religion and all the blessed influences which it can bring into the home.

These and other similar causes bring about a situation which results in many broken homes. They are broken by sin, by estrangements, by separations, and by divorce. These broken homes are not good training places for members of the Church or for citizens of the state. There is no institution in America to-day which is face to face with more social problems than the home. It is time to turn to the Bible to see what it has to say about the family, about marriage, about divorce, and about the other problems which confront the home to-day.

MARRIAGE

One of the first things that we learn in the Bible is that marriage is a divine ordinance, and that the family is a divine institution. We obtain this information in the second chapter of Genesis. In that chapter, we find a beautiful story of the creation of the woman. Matthew Henry suggests in his quaint way that the woman was not taken from the head of the man, to rule over him; nor yet from his feet, to be trampled upon by him; but from his side, near his heart, to be loved and cherished by him. The story shows in a very striking way the physical, intellectual, and spiritual affinity which exists between men and women. The

Creator made them so. Recognizing this affinity, the record proceeds: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."

Jesus reaffirmed this statement, and added to it. We are told in the nineteenth chapter of Matthew that the Pharisees tested Him by asking whether a man might divorce his wife for any and every cause. Jesus replied: "Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh? . . . What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

In the second chapter of Malachi, we have revealed to us in the following words God's purpose in founding the family: "Jehovah hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously, though she is thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did he not make one, although he had the residue of the Spirit? And wherefore one? He sought a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously with the wife of his youth. For I hate putting away, saith Jehovah, the God of Israel" (R. V.).

These three passages give us a picture of God's ideal for the family from the very beginning. There was to be one husband, and one wife, and they were to be bound so closely together in love that they would be one flesh. The ultimate purpose of this union was to raise up a godly seed. If it were not for the Christian

home, the Christian Church would soon perish from the earth. In this ideal, there was no place for divorce, for estrangements, or for separations. The Apostle Paul brings this ideal before us in a very striking way in his Epistle to the Ephesians, when he says: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it." Nothing could be more beautiful or ideal than the love which Christ has for His bride, the Church. Paul also pictures the place which children are to have in the home, and the love which ought to exist between parents and children. If the homes of our land could attain to the ideals which are set before them in the holy Scriptures, the problems of the home life of our country would be solved.

THE IDEAL AND THE ACTUAL

But poor, weak humanity has never yet attained to God's ideal in anything. We are therefore face to face with the actual, while we keep our eyes upon the more or less distant ideal. As an actual fact, the home life of even the outstanding men in the Old Testament was far from ideal. In the story of the first family, we see one brother striking the other down in cold-blooded murder. If you will think of the home life of Noah, Abraham, Lot, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David and Solomon, you will see that it was far from ideal. As we run over the story of these men, we see drunkenness, polygamy, incest, adultery, and murder.

Rauschenbusch, in his *Christianizing the Social Order,* pictures the situation in his own inimitable way. Referring to some of these ancient families, he says:

"Nevertheless, the fact remains that the family as an institution was based on despotism and exploitation. The relation of husband and wives, of father and children, of master and slaves, could be made fine and noble by personal goodness, but the personal virtue was constantly vitiated by the wrong inhering in the social order in which they lived. The Old Testament gives us an intimate insight into a number of families, . . . and not one of them shows us a good home from a modern point of view. Abraham was a true gentleman, whose acquaintance would be a benediction in any civilization; Jacob would surely be a millionaire and church elder if he lived today; David is one of the most brilliant and spiritual figures in history. Yet the family relations of these men were such that no self-respecting church could retain them as members if they did the same today. An unregenerate social institution put these good men into positions where they did wrong."

If we wish to get a glimpse of the Jewish conception of marriage and divorce when Jesus was on earth, we will have to turn to the Jewish Mishna, which gives a whole treatise on the subject. The Mishna quotes the opinions of a number of distinguished rabbis on the passage in Deuteronomy 24:1-2, which says: "When a man taketh a wife, and marrieth her, then it shall be, if she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some unseemly thing in her, that he shall write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife."

The Mishna tells us that the school of Rabbi Hillel taught that a man might divorce his wife under this law "even if she shall have burned his food in cooking, because he hath found something unseemly in her." It

also tells us that Rabbi Akiba taught that a man might divorce his wife if he found another fairer than she, as it is written, "if she find no favour in his eyes." Josephus, the Jewish historian, who wrote his histories about the time the apostles were writing the New Testament, says in his *Antiquities* of the Jews: "He that desires to be divorced from his wife for any cause (and many such causes happen among men) let him in writing give assurance that he will never use her as his wife any more."

These quotations are in line with the question which the Pharisees asked Jesus: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" They evidently thought it was lawful. The majority of Jewish leaders and teachers in the time of Christ held very loose views about marriage and divorce.

Out in the pagan world, family life seems to have been infinitely worse. Charles Loring Brace, in his *Gesta Christi,* has collected for us some pictures of family life in Rome, as pictured by contemporary Roman writers between 100 B. C. and 100 A. D.

Cicero, the great orator and philosopher, married Terentia, an heiress. When he had spent her fortune and had gone deeply into debt, he divorced her and married another wealthy woman, in order that he might get her dowry to pay his creditors. Later on, he divorced his second wife because she did not mourn sufficiently over the death of his daughter by Terentia. Cato, the celebrated Roman statesman and philosopher, divorced his wife, Attilia, and married another. Later he transferred his second wife to his friend Hortensius.

Cæsar Augustus divorced his wife and then compelled the husband of Livia to leave her, in order that he might have Livia for his own wife. Juvenal, the Roman satirist, tells of a woman who had eight husbands in five years. Jerome, who translated the Bible into the Latin Vulgate, tells of a woman in Rome who was married to her twenty-third husband, she being his twenty-first wife. Seneca wrote: "There is not a woman left in Rome who is ashamed of being divorced, now that the most distinguished ladies count their years, not by the consuls, but by their husbands." Conditions became so bad that the Roman senate, in the year 19 A. D., passed a law that no woman whose grandfather or whose husband had been a Roman knight was permitted to make her person venal.

DEALING WITH THE ACTUAL

These two pictures, one from Palestine, a centre of religion, and the other from Rome, a centre of culture, give us some idea of how far the actual was from the ideal when Jesus came into the world. In the face of these conditions, Jesus re-affirmed the ideal which was given in the beginning. This ideal pictured a home in which there was to be one husband and one wife, and they were to be so united by love and purity that they would constitute one flesh. There was no place for divorce, separations, or infidelity in this ideal.

But Jesus realized that it was necessary to deal with conditions as they were. He knew that poor, weak humanity had not reached the ideal. He knew that there would be lust and unchastity. He, therefore, in His

teachings allows a divorce to be granted for the one cause of fornication, but for no other. When the Pharisees reminded Him that His teachings were more strict on this subject than the teachings of Moses, He replied: "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives, but it was not so from the beginning." Moses had to lead the people as they could understand and follow, and therefore made concessions which were not ideal. God has always led His people as they could understand and follow. You will recall Paul's statement on Mars's Hill: "The times of ignorance, therefore, God overlooked." You will also recall the statement of Jesus to His disciples on the night before the crucifixion, saying that He had many things that He would like to say to them, but that they could not bear (or understand) them then. He accordingly promised to send the Holy Spirit, who would teach and lead them until He had led them into all truth.

Jesus, facing the actual, allowed a divorce for the one cause of fornication, and yet He stood by the ideal. That is the end toward which His people should ever be looking. It is worthy of note that, while Jesus never advocated any particular form of government or any particular social order, He did stand for the integrity and sanctity of the home in the most unmistakable terms. It is the one social organization that is of divine origin. There is no place in the ideals of Jesus for trial marriages, broken homes, or promiscuous divorces.

FAMILY LIFE IN AMERICA

Nineteen centuries have gone by. The teachings of

Jesus have been working like leaven through all those centuries. We live in one of the most favoured lands that the world has ever known. What can we say of family life in favoured America to-day?

In his book, *Christianizing the Social Order,* Dr. Rauschenbusch expressed the opinion that the family is the most Christian institution in America. The following paragraph gives his point of view:

"The simplest and most familiar social organization is the family. It is also the most Christian. It is so Christian that the word 'Father' has become the most satisfactory symbol of a loving God, and the word 'child' the most trustful expression of our relation to Him. When Jesus substituted these family terms for the old royal conceptions, with their connotations of despotism, the change meant a redemption of religion. Wherever the members of a social organization have taken to calling one another 'brother,' it has stood for high social ideals. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is one of the cherished phrases of our time; it expresses the faith that the same solidarity and tenderness which we know in family life will yet become common in the wider social relations."

There have always been some beautiful Christian homes in America. They were brought here by the Scotch and Scotch-Irish and other Christian people of Europe. Robert Burns, in *The Cotter's Saturday Night,* has drawn an unforgettable picture of those Scotch homes. The most beautiful picture of all is that which Dr. John G. Paton, the distinguished missionary to the New Hebrides, draws of the Scotch home in which he was brought up. Turn to his autobiography and read that chapter at your first opportunity. There

were many Christian homes like that transplanted to America.

However, the home life of America in those early days was not always ideal. While preparing these lectures, I have been reading the new life of Abraham Lincoln by the late Senator Beveridge. A few facts and quotations from these two large volumes will illustrate what I am trying to say, without going any further.

Nancy Hanks, the mother of Abraham Lincoln, was born not far from Harrodsburg, Kentucky, of an unmarried mother. A relative of hers, Polly Hanks, was the mother of six illegitimate children. The records show that at the first session of the court in Harrodsburg, Kentucky, in 1783, there were seventeen indictments, and of these, eight were for fornication. In speaking of the marriage of Thomas Lincoln and Nancy Hanks, the parents of Abraham Lincoln, Senator Beveridge says: "It is reasonable to suppose that the event was attended and followed by that boisterous merriment with which such ceremonies then were and, for half a century, continued to be celebrated, particularly by those of the class to which Thomas and Nancy belonged—the over-eating, over-drinking, violent sports, coarse jests, rude fun." Then he quotes from Daniel Drake's *Pioneer Life in Kentucky* the following statement: "Weddings, commonly in the daytime, were scenes of carousal, and of mirth and merriment of no chastened character. The same occurred at the infare."

When Abraham Lincoln was a child, his parents moved to southern Indiana. It is a rather dark picture which Senator Beveridge gives of the life in that com-

munity. He says: "Incredible quantities of liquor were consumed; everybody, women, and preachers included, drinking the fiery liquid. A bottle was in every cabin—to offer it was the first gesture of welcome, to refuse unpardonable incivility. . . . Men were quick to fight, and combats were brutal. Profanity was general and emphatic." Again, in speaking of the establishment of schools, he says: "And grave was the need of them. The drinking of whiskey, the fighting and swearing were accompanied by repellent conditions of living. Men and boys told noisome anecdotes, social relations were loose and undisciplined." In a footnote he says: "At the first circuit court of Perry County, Indiana, April 3, 1815, nearly all indictments were for rape, divorce, bigamy, slander, assault and battery, and adultery. Several divorces were granted, usually for unfaithfulness to the marriage vows, and for desertion. Six or seven slander and divorce cases were tried at every term of court."

Those are dark pictures of certain sections of American home life in those pioneer days. They are probably not overdrawn. Senator Beveridge was a careful investigator and always gives references to contemporary documents in his footnotes. Much of the family life in those times was far from ideal.

The years have passed by. There are still thousands and tens of thousands of beautiful Christian homes in America. The ideal of home life has probably been raised very much above the ideals which existed in the early pioneer days. Yet there are at present certain disintegrating forces at work which are alarming.

The divorce rate in America is higher than ever before. It is higher than that of any country in the world, unless it is Japan. Nearly two hundred thousand divorces are granted each year in the United States. There is an average of one divorce for every seven marriages. There are more than thirty causes for divorce, recognized by the combined laws of our forty-eight states. It is very much as it was back in the days of the Pharisees when a divorce could be had for any and every cause. If a couple wishes to secure a divorce, no matter what the cause may be, the divorce can be secured somewhere within the United States.

It is astonishing to see the number of thoughtful people who are seriously advocating trial marriages, or companionate marriages, and the number is increasing. They see no other way out of this labyrinth of divorces and separations.

The social evil seems to be more flagrant than ever. The revelations which were made by examining physicians during the World War were astonishing. A book like Judge Lindsey's book, *The Revolt of Modern Youth,* startles us and makes us hang our heads in shame. It tells of relationships between young men and young women, and even between high school boys and girls, which those of us who have lived a more sequestered life had never dreamed of.

Our Department of Religious Education included Judge Lindsey's book in a list of books ordered for our library recently. I promptly received an anonymous letter, the only one I ever received from a student, containing the following sentences:

"I cannot understand why the book, *The Revolt of Modern Youth,* by Judge Ben Lindsey, should be on the shelves of our library. The writer drags the reader through so much filth and mire. He is not normal and creates a vicious influence mentally and morally. I maintain that the students of this institution (they range from twenty to forty years of age) are not yet mature enough to read his books, nor ever will be so long as they wish to retain mental self-respect. As for me, having read the book a few minutes, I will now resort to soap and water."

Judge Lindsey does take us through the mire. Yet he pictures life literally as he has seen it. He wants us to see the world in which we are living, in order that we may help to make it a better world. We cannot make it better by hiding our heads in the sand as the proverbial ostrich is said to do. Books of this kind help us to see something of the darker side of family life in America.

Dr. Rauschenbusch may be right in saying that the family is the most Christian of all social institutions, and yet the family is a long way from the millennium. But let us turn to the practical side of this subject.

WHAT CAN THE CHURCH DO?

What can the Church, its ministers, and its members do to solve the social problems connected with the family, and to bring the family life of America closer to the ideals of Jesus? Much, in every way.

1. We can continue to preach the good old-time Gospel of personal salvation. In order to remake the home, it will be necessary first of all to remake its individual members. To paraphrase Herbert Spencer, you cannot

make a golden family out of members who have only leaden instincts.

2. We can continue to preach the supreme importance of family religion. Irreligion lies back of most of the problems connected with the family life of America. Reference has been made to the autobiography of Dr. John G. Paton. Let me quote first a few paragraphs from the chapter on his early home life in Scotland:

"And so began in his early life that blessed custom of Family Prayer morning and evening, which my father practised probably without one single omission till he lay on his deathbed, seventy-seven years of age; when, even to the last day of his life, a portion of Scripture was read, and his voice was heard softly joining in the Psalm, and his lips breathed the morning and evening prayer, falling in sweet benediction on the heads of all his children, far away many of them over all the earth, but all meeting him there at the throne of grace. None of us can remember that any day ever passed unhallowed thus; no hurry for market, no rush to business, no arrival of friends or guests, no trouble or sorrow, no joy or excitement, ever prevented at least our kneeling around the family altar, while the high priest led our prayers to God, and offered himself and his children there."

"We had, too, special Bible Readings on the Lord's Day evening,—mother and children and visitors reading in turns, with fresh and interesting question, answer and exposition, all tending to impress us with the infinite grace of a God of love and mercy in the great gift of His dear Son Jesus, our Saviour. The Shorter Catechism was gone through regularly, each answering the question asked, till the whole had been explained, and its foundation in Scripture shown by the proof-texts adduced."

"Others must write and say what they will, and as they feel; but so must I. There were eleven of us brought up in a home like that; and never one of the eleven, boy or girl, man or woman, has been heard, or ever will be heard, saying that Sabbath was dull or wearisome for us, or suggesting that we have heard of or seen any way more likely than that for making the day of the Lord bright and blessed alike for parents and children. But God help the homes where these things are done by force and not by love! The very discipline through which our father passed us was a kind of religion of itself. If anything really serious required to be punished, he retired first to his closet for prayer, and we boys got to understand that he was laying the whole matter before God; and that was the severest part of the punishment for me to bear. I could have defied any amount of mere penalty, but this spoke to my conscience as a message from God. We loved him all the more, when we saw how much it cost him to punish us; and, in truth, he had never very much of that kind of work to do upon any one of all the eleven—we were ruled by love far more than by fear."

"The 'closet' was a very small apartment betwixt the other two, having room only for a bed, a little table, and a chair, with a diminutive window shedding diminutive light on the scene. This was the sanctuary of that cottage home. Thither daily, and oftentimes a day, generally after each meal, we saw our father retire, and 'shut to the door;' and we children got to understand by a sort of spiritual instinct (for the thing was too sacred to be talked about) that prayers were being poured out there for us, as of old by the High Priest within the veil in the Most Holy Place. We occasionally heard the pathetic echoes of a trembling voice pleading as if for life, and we learned to slip out and in past that door on tiptoe, not to disturb the holy colloquy. The outside world might not know, but we knew, whence came that happy light as of a new-born smile that always was dawning on my father's face: it was a reflection from the Divine Presence, in the consciousness of which he lived.

Never, in temple or cathedral, on mountain or in glen, can I hope to feel that the Lord God is more near, more visibly walking and talking with me, than under that humble cottage roof of thatch and oaken wattles."

3. We can teach and preach the social and ethical teachings of Jesus and apply them to the home. The Golden Rule, the Royal Law of Love and other great teachings of that kind were intended for the home as well as for the individual and for the larger units of the social order. The application of such teachings to the home life would do much to solve its social problems.

4. We can preach on the sacredness of marriage and do everything possible to hallow the marriage relationship in the eyes of the people. There is great need for marriage reform. There is still a large pagan element connected with our so-called Christian marriages.

Recently I wrote an article on funeral reform, calling attention to extravagances and excesses which are connected with some funerals. I promptly received a letter from the pastor of an outstanding Presbyterian Church, which reads as follows: "I am inclined to think that the expenditures on church weddings are even more unchristian than the expenditures on funerals. I have had weddings in my church where a conservative estimate of the cost of decorating the church would be not less than five hundred dollars. I have had weddings in which several policemen were called in to preserve order and to keep traffic in front of the church moving. I had one wedding in which people piled up hymn-books and Bibles and stood upon them in order to see the procession. What is the result? It

is this: that many girls who have worked in the Sunday School and church since the days of infancy pick up and go to distant cities to be married, because they are not able to finance a church wedding. Is it not deplorable that a girl who has worked in the church for many years cannot be married in her church? "

When we think of all the flippancy connected with wedding rehearsals, the worldliness of the wedding itself, the intoxicants which often flow at wedding receptions, and the horseplay and boisterousness of those who see the newly-married couple to the train, we can readily understand how our young people think of marriage as a picnic or an adventure, instead of thinking of it as a divine ordinance. There is no more important task before the Church to-day than that of giving her young people a more Christian conception of marriage.

5. The minister can be more careful about the marriages which he performs. He should resolve in his heart that he will never be a party to a secret marriage, and that he will never marry a runaway couple. The Roman Catholic Council of Trent made the following wise decree in reference to the publication of marriage banns:

" In order to place a check upon clandestine marriage, to discover any impediments which may exist, to prevent deceptions and surprises, to afford parents and others interested an opportunity to interpose if needful, and in order to procure the prayers of the faithful that God may give light, grace, and prosperity to the contracting parties, the Council of Trent has decreed that the promises of marriage be published on three successive Sundays, or Holydays, at the principal mass by the parish priest of the parties."

The Evangelical Church of Germany, and the Church of England retained this custom. In the Book of Discipline, prepared by John Knox for the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, it was provided that marriages should take place in church on Sunday, and young people were not permitted to marry without the full consent of their parents. However, if the parents seemed to be unreasonable, the young couple could appeal to the church. These rules made hasty marriages, secret marriages and runaway marriages impossible. Not only so, but they emphasized the fact that marriage is a divine ordinance and the family a divine institution.

The minister should also make a holy resolve that he will not marry divorced people, except in case of the innocent party; and he might even take the risk of erring on the right side by resolving that he will not marry any divorced person, whether innocent or guilty. We can redeem the present situation only by putting marriage on the highest and holiest plane.

6. Ministers and Christian teachers can expound the teachings of Jesus concerning divorce. Jesus' ideal for the family is that there should be no divorce for any cause, but that the husband and wife should be so united by love that they would be one flesh. In facing the actual world, with all its sin and wickedness, He allowed divorce for the one cause of fornication. As a matter of fact, our state laws allow divorces for more than thirty causes. Christians might well stand for divorce laws that are more in keeping with the teachings of Jesus.

The minister and Christian worker should also

preach against the causes which lead up to divorce. In the most complete census which the United States Government has ever taken on the subject, the major causes assigned for divorces were adultery, drunkenness, cruelty, and desertion. It ought not to be difficult to preach against such causes. Yet the subject is one of such delicacy that many ministers hesitate to touch upon it.

One day I was attending services at a fine, historical old church, which has a liturgical service. In one part of that service, the minister read the ten commandments, and after each commandment the choir sang a response. When the minister came to the seventh commandment, he skipped it and did not read it at all. The subject was too delicate; and yet it was not too delicate for our Lord. There were probably more people in that large congregation who needed to hear and to heed the seventh commandment than any other commandment in the entire decalogue.

7. The Church, through Christian parents and discreet Christian workers, should find some way of teaching our young people the supreme importance of personal purity. I do not believe that our young people have gone utterly to the bad. There are still thousands and tens of thousands of them who are just as fine as ever. Yet books like that of Judge Lindsey show us that there are many young people who have lost their personal purity and are living down in the cesspools of life.

The Church must find a way of introducing her young people into the mystery of life which will make them feel that their very bodies are temples of the

Holy Spirit, and that these temples must be kept pure. This is one of the most delicate and difficult of all the tasks which lie before Christian fathers and mothers.

Some of you will recall the poem of Ella Wheeler Wilcox, entitled "The Price He Paid." The young man, in his waywardness and ignorance, trod the paths of sin; little dreaming of the consequences. Later on he married a pure and lovely girl. When their first child was born, it was blind and deformed. Not only so, but the young mother was left an utter wreck. In the last stanza of the poem, the young husband cries:

"I said that I must have my fling,
And they knew the path I would go;
Yet no one told me a thing
Of what I needed to know.
Folks talk too much of a soul
From heavenly joys debarred—
And not enough of babes unborn,
By the sins of their fathers scarred."

The best Mother's Day letter that I ever saw was written to his mother by a college student, toward the close of his Sophomore year. After expressing his affection, he said: "There are three things that you have especially done for me that make me love you all the more. You have brought me up in a Christian home, which is the greatest thing of all; you have given me a passage of Scripture, Ephesians 3:14-19, which expresses your devotion to me, and which I have endeavoured to direct my life by; and lastly you have taught me to love beauty and purity, which is one of the greatest things that a man can have."

Before Elijah went, he turned to Elisha and asked what he could do for him. The younger man replied: "Let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me." The greatest thing which the older generation can do for those of the younger generation is to give them the right spirit and the right ideals. If the next generation is to have pure and noble fathers and mothers, we must teach the young people of this generation the meaning of purity and the meaning of parenthood.

When I think of the responsibility of the Church and of Christian parents, and of the marvellous opportunity which they have for shaping the lives of children and young people, the words of the Psalmist come to me: "Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make princes in the earth."

VII

THE BIBLE AND WAR

WAR is the greatest social problem that faces the human race today. It is the most terrible curse that ever afflicted mankind. If there were any process by which we could estimate the destruction of life and property which has been wrought by war in the history of the world the results would be simply appalling. A few years ago we were waging a war to end war. To-day a survey made by the League of Nations shows that there are 5,500,000 men under arms in the regular armies of the nations, to say nothing of millions more who are in the reserves. The survey also shows that the cost of maintaining these armies is $3,500,000,000.00 a year. This is all in addition to the war debts under which the nations are staggering.

We think of the United States as a peace-loving nation, and so it is. But in 1920 the Treasury Department gave out some figures which are startling. From the founding of our nation in 1789 up to 1920 the United States Government collected and spent for all purposes $66,000,000,000. Of this amount $53,000,000,000 was spent for wars, present, past, and future. About the same time the Treasury Department presented statistics which show that the United States

Government is now spending over eighty per cent of its annual income for war.

The Great War brought death to millions upon millions of the finest young men in the world. It left millions of others maimed for life. It filled the world with anguish and sorrow. It destroyed four hundred billion dollars' worth of property. It has been followed by a wave of demoralization and lawlessness from which it will take many years to recover. It left the nations bowed down beneath a burden of debt from which they see no relief. General Sherman was right when he said that war is hell.

We will continue to have war as long as we think in terms of war. For, after all, war results from a state of mind. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he. The same is true of a nation. It is high time for Christian people to do some straight thinking on this whole subject. The Bible is the Christian's guide-book through this world. Has it any message on the subject of war? Let us search the Scriptures and see.

GOD'S IDEAL

A study of the Bible has convinced me that God's ideal for the world is, and always has been, that it should be a warless world. I am aware that there is a great deal of war in the Old Testament. I am also aware that it is possible to say that Jesus did not definitely outlaw war when He was upon earth. This may all be perfectly true, and yet the statement stands that God's ideal for the world is that it should be a warless world. Let us see.

In the second chapter of Isaiah we find a beautiful and inspiring picture of world peace: "Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Where did Isaiah get that picture? Certainly he did not get it from the surrounding nations. Isaiah lived in the days of Tiglath-Pileser, Sargon, and Sennacherib, those mighty, warlike kings of Assyria and Babylonia. Assyria and Egypt were battling against each other for world dominion, and Palestine lay on the direct path between the two.

Nor did Isaiah get his vision from his own kings, for you will find that they, too, were warlike kings. Isaiah, in his long ministry, had seen one war follow fast upon another and was well acquainted with all the horrors of war. He must have gotten his vision from God, as he claimed to have done. So, then, it is not Isaiah's ideal, but God's ideal, and the ideal is that of a warless world.

This ideal made such a tremendous appeal to Micah that he reproduced it in his fourth chapter and added some additional touches to the picture. I am taking it for granted that Micah was quoting from Isaiah rather than Isaiah from Micah, as Isaiah was the older, the greater of the two. Be this as it may, it is a beautiful

picture of peace and of a world in which nation should never again lift up sword against nation, and in which the nations would learn war no more. War would be outside the pale of their thinking.

Isaiah gives us another unforgettable picture of a warless world in his ninth chapter: "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. . . . For all the armour of the armed man in the tumult, and the garments rolled in blood, shall be for burning, for fuel of fire [R. V.]. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end."

Some may say that this is a picture of the millennium. That does not affect our argument. It is the picture of a warless world. If God's ideal is that it should be a warless world, then His people should work with might and main to make it a warless world. Now turn to the forty-sixth Psalm, which was Martin Luther's favourite, and see a slightly different picture of a warless world: "Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations he hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth."

Here we see such a complete destruction of the instruments of war that it leaves the world looking as if some great desolation had been wrought. The bows and spears have been broken to pieces and the war-chariots have been burned. God reigns and there is great stillness and peace in the earth. God, and not the armaments of war, is the strength and refuge of His people.

All through the Psalms and prophets we get glimpses of similar pictures, showing us a world from which war has been banished. Even in the historical books of the Old Testament, which are full enough of war, we meet some very significant statements. I will give just one of these. It is in the twenty-second chapter of First Chronicles: "And David said to Solomon, My son, as for me, it was in my mind to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God: but the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars: thou shalt not build an house unto my name, because thou hast shed much blood upon the earth in my sight."

When we turn to the New Testament the first thing that we hear is the angel song: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." In the very forefront of the Sermon on the Mount we hear Jesus saying: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." In another part of the Sermon on the Mount He gives us a commandment in which He says: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you."

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus also said: "But I say unto you, resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." I am aware that Jesus is speaking primarily about the spirit of revenge in this passage, but He also speaks against the use of force. Interpret these words of Jesus as you will, they do not sound like a sentence which I ran across the other day from a military text-book which is being taught to thousands of our college boys. The sentence was this: "In this world of ours, force is the ultimate power." The greatest military genius which the world has ever produced uttered a striking saying which is more in keeping with the teachings of Jesus: "There are only two powers in the world, the spirit and the sword. In the long run, the sword will always be conquered by the spirit." Those are the words of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Jesus taught us to pray: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." In this petition we see that Jesus' ideal for the world is that it should be perfectly like heaven. When the world has become perfectly like heaven it will be a warless world.

Surely these passages, taken from various parts of the Bible, are enough to show us that God's ideal is, and has always been, that this should be a warless world.

THE OTHER SIDE

But there is another side to this picture. When we read our Bibles we see that the Old Testament is full of wars. Not only so, but we see that Jehovah per-

mitted, and even commanded, some of these wars. After the great deliverance at the Red Sea we are told that Moses and the children of Israel sang a song. One line of the song says: "Jehovah is a man of war." In the twenty-fourth Psalm we have another marvellously beautiful song in which this passage occurs: "Who is the king of glory? Jehovah, strong and mighty; Jehovah, mighty in battle." However, these passages were probably not intended to picture Jehovah as warlike, but to ascribe to Him their deliverance and victory. But whatever they may mean, there is plenty of war in the Old Testament.

When we turn to the New Testament the first preacher we meet is John the Baptist. As he preached, soldiers with many others came under deep conviction. When the soldiers came to John and asked: "What shall we do?" John did not tell them to throw down their arms and go home. Instead he said: "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages."

Jesus did not outlaw war. Instead He prophesied wars to come. He also said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." On the night in which He was betrayed, just as they were starting to Gethsemane, He said to His disciples: "He that hath a purse let him take it, and likewise his scrip; and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one."

However, if we will look up the context of these passages we will probably discover that Jesus was not referring to war. He came to send a sword in the

sense that His Gospel would create divisions. One member of the family might accept the Gospel and the others might reject it. This is happening continually in non-Christian lands, and thus sharp divisions have been created.

When Jesus suggested as they started to Gethsemane that it might be well for a disciple to sell his garment and buy a sword he evidently did not mean for them to literally use the sword. That was His way of saying that troublous times were ahead. When Peter drew his sword in Gethsemane and cut off the ear of the servant of the high priest Jesus said: " Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

But, after a full explanation has been made of these passages, it is still true that there is another side to the picture and that there is much in the Bible which seems to be out of harmony with God's ideal of a warless world. In fact, the two pictures on the face of them seem to be almost contradictory.

THE IDEAL AND THE ACTUAL

How can we reconcile these apparently conflicting views? First of all, we do well to remember that there is always a difference between the ideal and the actual. God's ideal for our individual lives is that they should be perfectly conformed to the image of His Son. But the actual is far from the ideal. President Cleveland made this distinction clear on one occasion when he said: " Gentlemen, we are confronted with a condition and not a theory."

We are always confronted with the actual while we keep in view the distant ideal. Through all these ages God has been dealing with the world as it actually is. He has been teaching men His ways and ideals as they could understand and follow. In Mark 10:5 Jesus tells the Jews that the law of Moses concerning divorce had permitted certain things because of the hardness of their hearts. They were not yet ready for the ideals of Jesus. In Acts 17:30 Paul, in his sermon on Mars's Hill, speaks to the Athenians about their past idolatry and then adds: "The times of this ignorance God overlooked [R. V.]; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."

In other words, God has been patient with His people and has led them as they could understand. He is still leading them. In His farewell address Jesus said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth. . . . He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." The Holy Spirit has through all the centuries been leading His people into a fuller understanding of the great spiritual and ethical teachings of His word.

John Robinson, the Pilgrim preacher, expressed this finely when, in his farewell address to the Pilgrim fathers who were departing to America, he said: "For I am very confident that the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of His holy Word." That truth and light come only as the people can understand and follow. Let me illustrate:

God's ideal for the married life from the beginning

has been that there should be one husband and one wife. Yet God permitted polygamy in the Old Testament. Abraham, Jacob, David, and Solomon were all polygamists. There were probably polygamists in the New Testament Church. What else did Paul mean when he said that a bishop should be the husband of one wife? The inference is that there were Church members who had more than one wife. They had married several wives before they were converted to Christianity. Paul intimates that, while such a man might be a Christian, he could not be an officer and standard bearer in the Church. But God gradually led His people out of polygamy as they could follow, and to-day there is not a Christian nation in the world which allows polygamy.

The same was true of slavery. From the beginning God's ideal has been a perfect Christian brotherhood. Yet He permitted and regulated slavery in the Old Testament. Not only so, but when Onesimus, the runaway slave, was converted, Paul sent him back to his master, Philemon. It is true that he sent with him a letter to Philemon in which he exhorted him to receive back his runaway slave as a brother beloved.

Jesus came into a world which probably had in it more slaves than freemen. Jesus came and slavery went. Some may say that it went in spite of His coming. I prefer to believe that it went because of His coming. At any rate the Spirit of God has been leading His people through all these years as they could understand until He has led them into new ideals concerning the brotherhood of mankind. Often the actual has

been far from the ideal, but God has patiently led His people on into a fuller understanding of His will and His ways.

So it has been with war. God's ideal for His world has always been that it should be a warless world. But the actual has been far from the ideal. There have been wars and rumours of wars. God has led His people as they could understand. Just now it seems to me that men and women everywhere are closer to God's ideal in their thinking about war than ever before in the history of the world. There are multitudes who are longing and praying for a warless world. Even statesmen are catching the vision and are trying to provide ways and means by which war will be banished from the world and from the thinking of men.

WHAT CAN THE CHRISTIAN DO?

What can Christians do, and what can the Church do, to prevent war, and to usher in a reign of peace? There is much they can do.

First of all, we can continue to preach the Gospel of the cross and individual redemption. We can remake the world only as we remake the individual. Men must be born again. Peacemakers are the children of God, and the children of God are peacemakers.

We can preach against the causes of war. Some of these are very obvious. Hate is one of them. Nations cannot fight without hating. The world is full of hate. There is individual hatred, class hatred, racial hatred, and national hatred. The very children of some nations are taught to hate other nations. In the face of

all this hatred, the Church needs to emphasize the fact that there is no place for hate in the whole Christian system.

Greed, selfishness and covetousness are other causes of war. The national and commercial greed of one nation comes into conflict with that of another nation and the result is war. When men were busy trying to explain the causes of the Great War, I saw a little paragraph, which was meant to be semi-facetious, that came nearer explaining it than any of the philosophical essays that I read on the subject. It ran as follows: "Cause of the war—four expanding nations and only one planet." Expanding nations get in each other's way. If they are greedy and selfish, the result will always be war. We must emphasize the fact that there is no place for selfishness and covetousness of any kind in the whole Christian system.

The cultivation of the war spirit is another cause of war. Certain well-known newspaper writers are always urging us to get ready for war on a large scale. They want us to fill the sea with warships and the air with flying-machines. They name this nation or that as a nation which we must keep an eye on. In fact, they teach that there is no nation on earth that can be trusted. If a man says a word in behalf of peace, they sneeringly call him a "pacifist" and pass him by with contempt.

In due season this war spirit, if left unchecked, will precipitate any nation into war. Probably all of us believe that a city should have an adequate police system and that a nation should have adequate defenses.

But we also believe that all such matters can be attended to peaceably, without engendering hate and fear and the spirit of war in the hearts of the people. We should set our faces like Gibraltar against the war spirit. It is not the spirit of Jesus Christ.

We can stop glorifying war. For centuries the world has glorified war in history, in literature, in art, on monuments, and in every possible way. Even Christian institutions erect monuments and tablets to warriors, and neglect to erect them to soldiers of Christ who have died for the Gospel's sake in foreign lands. We see war on dress parade when the bands are playing and the flags are waving. It looks very attractive. Our blood tingles in our veins. We forget the muck, the mire, the stench, the blood, the agony and the death of it all.

We can preach peace in times of peace. The old maxim was: " In time of peace prepare for war." The Church of Christ would do well to change that and make it read: " In time of peace preach peace." That is the only time when we can preach it. If we preach peace in time of war, the government will put us where we cannot preach at all, and lock us up. If it be true, as I believe with all my heart, that God's ideal for His world is that it should be a warless world, then it is the duty of the Church to hold this ideal aloft and to preach peace.

We can also preach the Gospel of righteousness and justice between man and man and nation and nation. If we wish to do this, the Bible abounds in rich texts on the subject. There should not be one system of

ethics governing the conduct of individuals towards each other, and an entirely different system governing the conduct of one nation towards another.

When John Hay was Secretary of State, he startled the world by saying that the policy of the United States towards Latin America would be determined by the Monroe Doctrine and the Golden Rule. That was the first time the Golden Rule had ever been invoked in the diplomatic world. No wonder the newspapers put it in headlines on the front page. It was news. But why should it be news? Why should not the policies of all nations towards each other be determined by the Golden Rule?

We can co-operate with all agencies and organizations whose objects are to banish war and to usher in world peace. At present, our own country is taking the lead in trying to induce the nations of the earth to renounce war as a national policy for settling controversies. Perhaps a little later on we can go a bit further and lead the nations to outlaw war as a method of settling international disputes, and to re-write international law upon this new basis.

The idea of outlawing war can be illustrated by the outlawing of the duel. A hundred years ago it was considered perfectly proper and at times imperative that individuals should settle their controversies by the duel. Sometimes people wonder why a man like Alexander Hamilton accepted a challenge to fight a duel with Aaron Burr. Public opinion compelled him to do it. If he declined, he knew that he would be politically dead, and he preferred to risk physical death.

But people began to do some straight thinking in reference to the duel. Public opinion reversed itself, and went into revolt against the duel. Laws were put upon the statute books outlawing the duel, and telling men that they must no longer settle their disputes by gun-fire, but that they must take them to the proper courts for adjudication. To-day a man who sends a challenge to a duel can be arrested. Of course the right of self-defense remains to the individual, but he must take his disputes to the proper courts of law.

Some of you may live to see the nations outlaw war as the duel has been outlawed, and to see a complete revulsion of feeling and opinion in reference to war as a means of settling international disputes. Some of you may even live to see the whole of international law re-written on that new basis.

We can preach the Gospel of love and brotherhood, and thus create an atmosphere in which war cannot live. That was Jesus' method of dealing with social problems. He seldom made a frontal attack upon them. He created an atmosphere in which they could not live.

There are two ways of dealing with a great iceberg as it comes drifting down out of the Arctic regions. One is what we may call the *Titanic* method. Some fifteen years ago, there was built in England the most palatial ocean steamer that had ever been built up to that time. The newspapers heralded the news that here at last was a great ship which could not be sunk. It was named the *Titanic*. Some of the most distinguished men of Europe took passage on it for its

maiden voyage to America. All went well for a few days, but one night the *Titanic* ploughed full-steam-ahead into a great iceberg. It was a frontal attack. The iceberg did not even quiver. The *Titanic* went down.

The other way of dealing with an iceberg is what we may call the Gulf-stream way. In due time that same iceberg drifted into the Gulf-stream and rapidly disappeared. It could not live in that atmosphere. By its Gospel of love and brotherhood, Christianity should create an atmosphere in which war cannot live.

There is an eloquent passage in the recently published *Memories and Reflections of the Late Earl of Oxford and Asquith,* which illustrates forcibly the necessity of creating a moral atmosphere which is hostile to war. You will recall that he was the Prime Minister of England during the early years of the Great War. Here is the passage:

"Unless we can eliminate war, it will be the death of civilization, and all that makes life—individual life, communal life, international life—worth living. There can be no effective safeguard of the most treasured possessions and promises of our race until we have wiped international warfare off the slate of possibility. That is no Utopian ideal. As difficult, if you like, as unimaginable things have been done. Slavery, private war, duelling were all regarded in their day as natural and even necessary institutions. Why and how have they disappeared? Not by repression, not by coercion, but through the operation of moral force which sapped their vitality, which discredited their authority, and which brought them, in due time, one and all their message of doom. So it will be when, by the same agencies, the

curse of war becomes, as it will become, a memory of the past."

The one great power which can create this moral atmosphere is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

AMERICA FIRST

There is a mistaken conception of patriotism which insists that we must always go armed to the teeth; that we must instantly resent everything that looks like a national insult, and that we must vociferously, or at least silently, stand by our country, whether she is in the right or in the wrong, without even pointing to what we believe to be the right.

Those were stirring words which were spoken by Stephen Decatur, in response to a toast, in the city of Norfolk, a little more than a hundred years ago, but they are not entirely Christian: "Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong!"

I saw a much finer and more Christian paragraph than that last summer. It was from the pen of Bishop G. Ashton Oldham. It was beautifully printed and framed and hanging in the library of Grove City College in Pennsylvania. I wish to commend it to you as holding before our country a great Christian ideal. The paragraph is entitled, "America First":

"Not merely in matters material, but in things of the spirit.

Not merely in science, inventions, motors, and skyscrapers, but also in ideals, principles, character.

Not merely in the calm assertion of rights, but in the glad assumption of duties.

Not flaunting her strength as a giant, but bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a Good Samaritan.

Not in pride, arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples, but in sympathy, love, and understanding.

Not in treading again the old, worn, bloody pathway which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster, but in blazing a new trail, along which, please God, other nations will follow, into the new Jerusalem, where wars shall be no more.

Some day some nation must take that path—unless we are to lapse once again into utter barbarianism.

And that honour I covet for my beloved America.

And so, in that spirit and with these hopes, I say with all my heart and soul: America First."

I know of no better way of closing this lecture than with those words of Isaiah, which stand at the close of his great vision in which he saw the implements of war destroyed and the reign of the Prince of Peace ushered in. And these are the words:

"O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord."

VIII

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL REFORM

THE Church stands face to face with a multitude of the most urgent social problems. There are the problems of war, the eternal conflict between capital and labour, marriage and divorce, the social evil, child labour, the liquor traffic, extreme wealth, extreme poverty, race prejudice, criminology, illiteracy, the dependent classes, and many other kindred problems. At the same time, the Church holds in her hand the Bible, her infallible rule of faith and practice, and this Bible is full of social and ethical teachings, which seem to be applicable to these social problems. What is the duty of the Church in the face of these problems? In other words, what is the relationship of the Church to social reform?

The Church may, and does, come into contact with social problems in three distinct ways: through the individual members of the Church, through the ministers, and through the regularly constituted courts of the Church.

INDIVIDUAL CHRISTIANS AND SOCIAL REFORM

The greatest contribution which the Church can make towards the solution of social problems is the redemption of the individual. We can remake society

only by remaking the individuals who compose society. Not only so, but there is much that the individual can do for social reform when once he himself has been redeemed. Let us summarize the many things that the individual Christian can do to help.

First of all, he can study the social problems in the world about him. So many people go on their way through the world utterly oblivious of its social problems. Either they are so intent upon something else that they do not take time to read the meaning of the problems which they see on every side, or they have no eyes to see. We are apt to see only those things which we have been trained to see as we take our journey through the world.

The individual Christian can also study his Bible with a view to getting its social teachings which are applicable to the problems which he sees on every side. As we study our Bibles, we are apt to see only those things which we have been taught to see. Perhaps we have never discovered that the Bible is vibrant with a great social message. It may be well at times, in approaching our Bibles, to close all of our eyes except our social eye, and thus go through it with the very distinct purpose of getting its social message. This is a side of the Bible which has been sorely neglected, as I have tried to show you in the preceding lectures.

The individual can endeavour to put the social teachings of the Bible into practice in his own personal life in all of its relationships. He should endeavour to put them into practice in the home. There are still many social problems connected with our home life in

America. The home is a small unit of society in which we train for the larger, Christian citizenship. If we have not learned how to live with others in the home and how to be considerate of their rights and comforts, we are not prepared to go out into the larger fields of life. The practice of the teachings of Jesus by all the members of the home would reduce the problems of the home to a minimum, and would revolutionize the home life of America.

The individual Christian should endeavour to put the social teachings of the Bible into practice in his own community. Every community has its own social problems. They will be solved only as the individuals of that community practice the teachings of Jesus. Let me illustrate: One of the greatest problems before our country at this moment is the liquor traffic. The first step in the solution of that problem is for every Christian in this country to resolve that by the grace of God he will observe the laws of the land. The Bible makes it perfectly clear that it is the will of God that Christians should observe all the laws of the land. If all who profess to be Christians would observe all the laws of the land, it would go a long way toward solving the tremendous problem of lawlessness which is afflicting our country just at this time.

The individual Christian can practice the social teachings of the Bible in his business, whether he is an employer or employee. He can accept the high ideals of Jesus as the ideals of his business. He can endeavour to put into practice the social teachings of the Bible in his dealings with those who work with him or

under him. He can adopt business principles that are in keeping with the teachings of Jesus, and he can pay what he believes to be a Christian wage. Thus, through the channels of his own business life, he can accomplish much for social reform.

The individual Christian is also a citizen, and as such he can take a full part in all social reforms which are undertaken by legislative bodies. As a Christian citizen, he can vote for those men and measures that he believes will best promote true social reform. This often takes a great deal of courage where the civil government is carried on by the party system, for it is considered the unpardonable political sin for a man to break his party ranks. At any rate, the Christian citizen has a large and unlimited field for the exercise of all his gifts and energies for all social reforms which he believes are in keeping with the social teachings of the Bible. All the avenues of life, including the legislative halls, are open to him. The Church, through the Christian citizen, comes into contact with all kinds of social problems, and has an opportunity of influencing all kinds of social reforms. In order to make the most of such opportunities, the Church will have to educate its members in the social teachings of the Bible, and will have to impress upon them the duties and responsibilities of Christian citizenship.

In reading André Siegfried's new book, *America Comes of Age,* I ran across a striking paragraph. You would probably find yourself in protest, or even open revolt against some things in this book by Siegfried, who is a Frenchman, but who has studied American

life with penetrating insight. But you will probably find yourself in full agreement with this paragraph:

"Calvin looked upon doctrines as a means to an end, and taught that the duty of the individual was not to concentrate upon himself, but rather to co-operate in furthering the will of God in this world. Born anew through grace, the Calvinist has a mission to carry out; namely, to purify the life of the community and to uplift the state. He cannot admit two separate spheres of action, for he believes that the influence of Christ should dominate every aspect of life. He considers it of utmost importance that the virtuous should take their place in the life of the community as active Christians, whereas in former times they withdrew from the world in order to remain pure. . . . Calvin united religion and daily life for the first time since the days of the ancients, for, according to his creed, the better the faithful performed their daily task, the more they worked for the glory of God."

THE MINISTER AND SOCIAL REFORM

Perhaps we could all agree very cordially on the duty of the Christian citizen in reference to social reform, but when we come to the minister's place in social reform, we are upon controversial ground. I do not suppose that anybody who read the newspapers during the recent revolution connected with the presidential campaign would dispute that statement. However, I suspect that there are some points on which we can all agree.

The minister, like the Christian citizen, should study the social problems of his own community and of his own land. The minister ought to know life, and he cannot know it without knowing its problems. The

minister is a servant, and a part of his mission is to help people all that he can. But he cannot help them without knowing their problems. There ought always to be a note of reality in the minister's preaching, but it will lack that note of reality unless he knows life as it is.

The minister, like the Christian citizen, should study the social teachings of the Bible. The Bible is the minister's great textbook, and he ought to know it from every point of view. Of course he ought to know its great doctrines of grace and redemption for the individual. At the same time, he should know its social and ethical teachings.

Like the Christian citizen, the minister should practice the social teachings of the Bible in all the relationships of life. The daily life of the minister leaves a deeper impression upon the community than his preaching. When I was a seminary student, I read *The Preacher and His Models*, by Dr. James Stalker. It was a new book then. I do not suppose that seminary students read it now. It left quite a deep impression on me. There is one paragraph which has lingered with me during all these years. Here it is:

> "The great purpose for which a minister is settled in a parish is not to cultivate scholarship, or to visit the people during the week, or even to preach to them on Sunday, but it is to live among them as a good man, whose mere presence is a demonstration which cannot be gainsaid that there is a life possible on earth which is fed from no earthly source, and that the things spoken of in church on Sabbath are realities."

The same truth is brought out by an incident in the life of Francis of Assisi. It is related that one day he went to one of the younger preachers in the monastery and said: "My son, let us go and preach to-day." So they went out through the great iron gate of the monastery and made their way to the city. Then they walked through the suburbs, the business streets, and some of the lowlier alleys. At length, before the young man realized it, they had made a complete circuit and were back at the monastery. In surprise, the young man looked at St. Francis and said: "Father, I thought that we were going out to preach to-day." The old saint replied: "So we did, and we have preached. We preached as we went. As we walked through the city, the people observed our walk and conversation, and it was a sermon to them." And then he added: "My son, it is not worth while for us to go anywhere to preach unless we preach as we go."

So far so good, we are all agreed that the minister ought to study the social problems that are in the world about him, that he ought to study the social teachings of the Bible, and that he ought to translate these teachings into his own life in all of life's relationships. But the question arises as to how far he should go in preaching on social problems and social reform from his pulpit. In the recent political campaign, the so-called "political parsons" were roundly condemned by the newspapers and by political speakers, and preachers of all kinds were admonished to preach the Gospel and to let politics and social reforms alone.

The Apostle Paul, in writing to Timothy, a young

minister, gave him this command: "I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom: Preach the word." That exhortation, as we believe, was placed in this Bible by divine inspiration, and was intended for us. That is the minister's commission: "Preach the word." If I might interpret that commission by expanding it, I would put it this way: Preach the Word, only the Word, but the whole Word, in the right proportion, and apply it to the hearts and lives of the people who are sitting before you. In your preaching, go wherever this Word goes, but do not go any further.

When you turn to the Word for your message, you will discover that it contains some great social and ethical teachings. Do not hesitate to preach these, but do it in the proper proportion. Rightly divide the Word of truth. Preach them as great principles of Christian living and tell your people that it is their duty to live by them in all the walks of life.

If you preach the Word, and only the Word, you will not bring partisan politics into the pulpit. I do not find the names of any of the political parties or of any of the presidential candidates in the Word. But I do find some comprehensive social and ethical principles which would help to guide the citizen in the proper exercise of his Christian citizenship. If you will allow me, perhaps I can illustrate what I am trying to say out of my own experience.

I lived in South Carolina back in the days when the state was dealing with the liquor problem by what was

called the Dispensary. It was a state-owned and controlled system which was akin to the present Canadian way of handling the liquor business. Incidentally I may say that it was bad enough. Any county in South Carolina had the privilege of voting in or voting out the Dispensary in that county. A red-hot campaign was on in my county as to whether we should have a Dispensary or no Dispensary in the county. I had many requests and petitions to preach against the Dispensary. I declined to do it, for I did not find anything about the Dispensary in the Word. But I did take my Bible at the Sunday morning service and tried to show that it stands for temperance and righteousness from cover to cover, and then I told the members of the church that it was their Christian duty to go out and stand for those men and measures which they honestly believed, in their hearts, would best promote temperance and righteousness. The warmest advocate for the Dispensary in town came forward and told me that I had preached the Word that day. The Dispensary was overwhelmingly defeated. I do not know that my sermon had any part in its defeat. I do know that it was impossible for me to keep silent at a time like that, when there was a great moral issue before the people, and I know that I tried to preach the Word and only the Word that day.

Perhaps you have heard of the young minister who, years ago, settled in a pastorate in Kentucky. After he had been there for a while and had seen something of the ravages of the whiskey traffic, he preached a strong sermon on temperance. After the sermon, an

officer in the church told him that it would never do to preach that kind of preaching in that community. "Why," he said, "our old Kentucky Bourbon whiskey is the finest in the world. If you want a popular ministry you must not preach that way any more."

After some months had elapsed, the young minister was impressed with the evils of the gambling which was connected with horse racing, and one Sunday he preached a broadside against the evils of gambling. Following the sermon, the same officer came forward and told him that it would never do for him to preach that way. "Why," he said, "our Kentucky race horses are the finest in the world. They are the pride of Kentucky. If you want a popular ministry, you must not preach like that again."

The young minister turned to his officer and said: "What would you like for me to preach about?"

The officer thought for a moment and replied: "The Jews! Give them the mischief. There is only one family of them in town."

It is a great deal easier to preach about the sins of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, who lived centuries ago, than it is to preach about the sins of the people who are sitting in the pews right in front of you. In fact, a preacher could have a good time in denouncing the deceit and trickery of Jacob. "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." That is a good rule for the minister.

But there is still another way in which the minister comes into contact with social problems and social re-

form. The minister is just as truly a citizen of the country in which he lives as any man in his church. When he went into the ministry, he did not renounce his citizenship, and he was not in any way deprived of it. The minister, as a citizen, has just as much right to take part in social reforms as any other citizen. In fact, he has just as much right to take part in a political reform as any other citizen. But let me pause just here to remind you that while all things may be lawful, all things may not be expedient. As a rule, it is better for the minister to refrain from partisan politics. As a rule, it is better for him and for the Church if he will let some layman take the leadership in social reforms. However, the time may come when it is vital for the minister, as a citizen, to take the lead in some social reform. There is a classic illustration of this in our own Southern Presbyterian Church.

Rev. Benjamin M. Palmer, D.D., who was for years pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans, was one of the greatest and one of the most eloquent preachers that our Church has produced. Get his biography by Dr. Thomas Cary Johnson and read it. Dr. Palmer was the Moderator of the first General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church, and preached the opening sermon on the headship of Jesus Christ over the Church. It is a plea for the complete separation of the Church and the state, and for the absolute spirituality of the Church.

After the Civil War, the Louisiana state lottery was established in New Orleans. It became a great gambling machine, and was one of the most corrupting in-

fluences not only in Louisiana, but in all that part of the country. The abolition of the Louisiana state lottery became a great moral question. It was strongly entrenched. The ministers of all denominations were stoutly opposed to it. Many of the ministers preached against it from their pulpits. In this day and time, they would probably be called " political parsons." So far as I can learn, Dr. Palmer, the minister, never referred to it in his pulpit. But one night Dr. Palmer, the citizen, went to the Grand Opera House in New Orleans, and there, before a great audience, brought to bear all his eloquence against the lottery. He was introduced as the first citizen of New Orleans, and so he was. As such, he had a right to speak. He did speak with such burning eloquence that men and women stood up on their chairs and shouted for the abolition of the lottery.

A distinguished Jewish rabbi, who was present in the audience that night, described the effect of the address upon himself as follows: " Always, except on this occasion, when listening to an address, even a great one, I have been able to say to myself, How far do you agree with the speaker? What do you reject? How far will you go with him? Where will you stop? But I give you my word, sir, that night Dr. Palmer did not permit me to think for myself, nor to feel for myself, nor to will for myself, but picked me up and carried me whithersoever he would. It did not seem to me that it was Palmer that was speaking. He spoke as one inspired. It seemed to me that God Almighty was speaking through Palmer. He had filled him with His

spirit and message as He filled the Hebrew prophets of old."

Dr. Palmer, the first citizen of New Orleans, had spoken. The lottery was doomed. Many others helped, but he turned the tide. But note well that Dr. Palmer did not try to lead every social reform. Note well, also, that he had lived in New Orleans a good many years as a minister and man of God before he was accounted the first citizen of that city. It was the life of the man behind his burning words that gave power to his message that night in the Grand Opera House.

The point that I am trying to make is that there may be times when the minister, as a citizen, ought to become the leader of a great moral or social reform. Those times do not come as often as some ministers imagine. When they do come, the minister, as a citizen, should not shrink from the task, no matter what the cost may be.

CHURCH COURTS AND SOCIAL REFORM

We come now to the most difficult question of all. What is the duty of church courts in reference to social reform? The individual member of the church is always a citizen, and as such has a right to take part in all manner of social reforms without any limitation. Not only is this his right, but it is his duty. The minister is also a citizen and as such has a right to take part in social reform, and it often becomes his duty to do so. But the church is always the church, and never a citizen. The question arises: What is the rela-

tionship of the organized church to social reform? This question becomes the more complicated when we remember that as a country becomes more and more Christian in its ideals, the state begins to deal with all kinds of social problems, and to take the lead in all manner of social reforms. If the church is also dealing with these same social problems and taking a part in these same social reforms, the church and the state find themselves in the same territory, and may find themselves in conflict. That at once raises the whole question of the relationship of the church and the state.

For many years the churches taught quarterly temperance lessons in their Sunday Schools, and did many other things to set forward the cause of temperance. During much of this time, the state was doing nothing along these lines. Nobody seemed to raise any objection to the church's doing all she could to educate her children in temperance and righteousness. In fact, nobody seemed to raise any objection if some of the churches expressed their opinions on the subject of prohibition, for nobody dreamed that one day there would be the rising of such a mighty tide of opposition to the liquor traffic. But a generation of voters and law-makers was being educated. These voters and law-makers carried the question of temperance and prohibition into the legislative halls of the state. Thus the Church and the state found themselves dealing with the same great moral reform, and sometimes the Church and the state found themselves in conflict upon the subject. In fact, the end is not yet. What is the

duty of the Church as an organized body in such cases? I do not wonder that Dr. Robert E. Speer, in his book, *The Gospel and the New World,* says that the two greatest unsolved problems in the world to-day are the race problem and the problem of Church and state.

Just here, let me quote a paragraph from the Westminster Confession of Faith:

> "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary, or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate."

But even that does not make the matter perfectly clear. We may all agree that "synods and councils (church courts) should conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical," and then we may not all agree as to what properly comes under the head "ecclesiastical." My dictionary defines "ecclesiastical" as that which pertains to the Church. But what pertains to the Church? That is the very question under discussion. We may all agree that the Church should not "intermeddle in civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," and then we may not agree as to what may be rightfully catalogued as belonging exclusively to civil affairs or to the commonwealth. Do not understand that I am finding fault with the Westminster Confession. I am in hearty accord with it, but it does not make perfectly clear the relation of the Church to

those social reforms which are at the same time being advocated by the state.

Let me turn to another notable historical document in our own church. When the first General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church was organized in 1861, an address was issued by that first Assembly to all the churches of Jesus Christ throughout the world. The address was prepared by Dr. James Henly Thornwell, one of the ablest Presbyterian ministers which this country, or any country, has produced. It gives some of the distinctive principles of our Church, and our reasons for organizing a new branch of the Presbyterian Church. In that address there is a striking paragraph on the relation of Church and state, which is very pertinent to the subject under discussion:

"The provinces of Church and State are perfectly distinct, and the one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other. The State is a natural institute, founded in the constitution of man as moral and social, and designed to realize the idea of justice. It is the society of rights. The Church is a supernatural institute, founded in the facts of redemption, and is designed to realize the idea of grace. It is the society of the redeemed. The State aims at social order, the Church at spiritual holiness. The State looks to the visible and outward; the Church is concerned for the invisible and inward. The badge of the State's authority is the sword, by which it becomes a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well; the badge of the Church's authority is the keys, by which it opens and shuts the kingdom of heaven, according as men are believing or impenitent. The power of the Church is exclusively spiritual; that of the State includes the exercise of force. The constitution of the Church is a divine revelation; the constitu-

tion of the State must be determined by human reason and the course of providential events. The Church has no right to construct or modify a government for the State, and the State has no right to frame a creed or polity for the Church. They are as planets moving in different orbits, and unless each is confined to its own track, the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world as the collision of different spheres in the world of matter. It is true that there is a point at which their respective jurisdictions seem to meet—in the idea of duty. But even duty is viewed by each in very different lights. The Church enjoins it as obedience to God, and the State enforces it as the safeguard of order. But there can be no collision, unless one or the other blunders as to the things that are materially right. When the State makes wicked laws, contradicting the eternal principles of rectitude, the Church is at liberty to testify against them, and humbly to petition that they may be repealed. In like manner, if the Church becomes seditious and a disturber of the peace, the State has a right to abate the nuisance. In ordinary cases, however, there is not likely to be a collision."

We will all have to admit that this is a very remarkable statement. Not only so, but we all probably find ourselves in full agreement with its main contention, and that is that there should be complete separation of Church and state. But it is a great deal easier to write this doctrine down on paper than it is to carry it into practice in actual life. The trouble is that all members of the Church are also citizens of the state, and it is not always easy for one to know when he is acting as a member of the Church, or when he is acting as a citizen of the state. Even a greater problem arises out of the fact that the Church and the state are often concerned with the same social problems. That may

not have been true in olden times, when the state gave itself little concern about social problems, and willingly turned all such problems over to the Church. But it is true to-day when the state, with its higher Christian ideals, concerns itself with all manner of social problems.

While these paragraphs from the Westminster Confession and from the "Address to the Churches" stand for complete separation of Church and state, they leave the Church the right of petition to the state on any matters which, in the judgment of the Church, affect the moral and spiritual life of the people.

Let us turn now to the Bible and see if we can find any principles to guide the Church in finding its relations to social reform. We may begin by asking: What is the business of the Church? The best answer to that question which is found in any single passage of Scripture is found in the Great Commission in Matthew 28:19-20: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you" (Am. R. V.).

According to this Great Commission, the Church has a twofold task: one is to make disciples of the nations, and the other is to teach the nations to live according to the teachings of Jesus. Of course these two tasks are to be carried forward simultaneously and not separately. The Church has seemed to have comprehended the meaning of the first part of her task, and has entered upon it with a good deal of vigour. But the second part of the task still languishes. The Church

has not done as much as she might have done in teaching men to live according to the teachings of Jesus. It is with the second part of the task that we are especially concerned in these lectures.

If the Church is going to teach men to live in all the relationships of life according to the teachings of Jesus, she must let men know what those teachings are, and she must make it clear that it is the duty of Christians to apply these teachings to business and to all kinds of social problems.

Our Book of Church Order states the matter finely in a paragraph which I think was framed by the Westminster Assembly:

> "The sole functions of the Church, as a kingdom and government distinct from the civil commonwealth, are to *proclaim,* to *administer,* and to *enforce* the law of Christ revealed in the Scriptures."

We have seen in these lectures that there are some great laws of the kingdom and some great ethical principles in the Bible which, if applied to every-day life, would solve many of our social problems. It is the business of the Church to *proclaim,* to *administer,* and to *enforce* these great principles. Let me illustrate.

The Bible contains some clear teachings on the subject of marriage and divorce. The divorce evil is one of the great social problems in our country to-day. There is need of far-reaching social reforms in reference to marriage and divorce. At this moment, the General Assembly of our church has a special committee studying these problems, and it is probable that our next General Assembly will make a clear-cut deliv-

erance on this subject. The Church has a right and a duty to proclaim, to administer, and to enforce upon its members the teachings of the Bible in reference to marriage and divorce. The state is also dealing with this same problem. The two need not come into conflict. However, the Church claims the right to petition the state on such a grave moral and spiritual problem, if she should deem it wise to do so.

We judge from the newspapers that there is an unusual amount of lawlessness abroad in the land to-day. The state is tremendously concerned about this. The Church is also concerned. There are many church members who do not seem to observe the laws. There are multitudes of good people who violate the automobile speed laws without any compunctions of conscience. The result is that there are many accidents and many people are killed or maimed for life. There are many people of good standing who openly flout the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It is not my purpose to discuss the merits or demerits of that amendment. I am simply calling attention to the fact that it is an integral part of the law of the land and of the very Constitution itself. In the same way, I might point out other laws which are being openly violated by people of good standing. This disregard of law on the part of reputable people gives a tremendous impetus to the spirit of lawlessness in the land.

The Bible makes it perfectly clear that it is the will of God that Christians should observe the laws of their land. Read the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the

Romans and see for yourself. It is the right and duty of the Church to enjoin upon its members that it is their Christian duty to conscientiously observe all the laws of their state and nation. Some strong deliverances from church courts upon this subject would be very wholesome just at this time.

There is an eternal conflict going on between capital and labour. Some people seem to think that the Church has nothing to do with this conflict. But the Bible has much to say about money, about the withholding of wages, and about the oppression of the poor. The Bible also contains the Golden Rule and the Royal Law of Love, which are highly applicable to employer and employee. It is the right and the duty of the Church to proclaim these great principles to her members, and to insist that they practice these teachings in all their business and industrial relationships. It would be a wholesome thing for church courts, from time to time, to make some clear deliverances, setting forth the teachings of Christ and of the Holy Scriptures which apply to employer and to employee out in the industrial world.

War is one of the greatest curses that ever afflicted mankind. The Bible has much to say on this subject. The ideal of the Bible is that this should be a warless world. It is the right and duty of church courts to make deliverances setting forth the teachings of the Bible, and the ideals of the Bible on this, the greatest social problem which faces the world to-day. Perhaps church courts have been too timid on this subject.

These illustrations are sufficient to show what I be-

lieve, according to the teachings of the Bible, to be the duty of the Church in reference to social reform. I believe that the Church has a right and a duty to proclaim to her people, not only from the pulpit, but through the deliverances of church courts, the social and ethical teachings of the Bible which apply to any and all social problems, and to insist that her members apply these teachings to their own lives, to their own business, and to the social problems with which they are confronted at any time. Perhaps church courts have confined their social deliverances too exclusively to cards, theatres and dancing, and at the same time neglected the weightier matters of the law. The time has come when the Church should *proclaim, administer,* and *enforce* the great ethical and social teachings of the Bible, which apply to the larger social problems of to-day. The Church can do this without intermeddling with affairs which belong exclusively to the commonwealth. Let the Church deal with these problems in her own way, according to the teachings of the Bible, and let the state deal with them in her own way.

CONCLUSION

In these lectures we have made at least a partial survey of the social and ethical teachings of Jesus and of the Bible. These teachings are very comprehensive and touch upon all the problems of life. Perhaps we can sum up the conclusion of the whole matter in one or two sentences. Jesus' ideal for the world is that the Kingdom of God should come on earth as it has already come in heaven, and that the will of God should be done

on earth as it is in heaven. He has commanded His Church to disciple the nations and to teach them to live according to His teachings. The Church should bring to bear all her resources of life, of possessions, and of prayer, for the accomplishment of this task, and for the realization of this ideal.

Printed in the United States of America

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01119 1717

Date Due

RESERVE	RESERVE	DE 8 '52	
	RESERVE	FE3-'55	
RESERVE	(R)	FEB 5 [illegible]	
	FACULTY	[illegible]	
(R) Pac	RESERVE	JAN 18 '74	
RESERVE			
RESERVE	(BL) U		
	Ap 18 '47	DEC 03 1998	
	FACULTY	JAN 04 1999	
(R) S	S 11 '47		
D 6 - '43	RESERVE		
RESERVE			
	(BL) Year's Preaching		
(BL)			
Mr 31 '44	RESERVE		
Ap 28 '44			
	DE 1 - '50		
	AP 20 '51		

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01000 5827